DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 572	CS 507 262
TITLE	Proceedings of the 1990 Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (73rd, Minneapolis, Minnesota, August 1-4, 1990). Part X: Journalism History Studies.
INSTITUTION	Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.
PUB DATE	Aug 90
NOTE	486p.; For other sections of these proceedings, see CS 507 256-263.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF02/PC20 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Communications; Criminals; *Editors; Elections; Females; *Journalism; *Journalism History; Labor Relations; *News Media; Political Campaigns; United States History; *War
IDENTIFIERS	American Society of Newspaper Editors; Journalism Research; *Journalists; *Professionalism; Scripps (E W)

ABSTRACT

The journalism section of the proceedings includes the following 18 papers: "A Newspaper Legacy: E. W. Scripps' Thoughts on Journalism in His Final Years" (Ted Pease); "The Great War of Words between the United States and Mexico: Public and Private Communications of the U.S. Government during World War I" (Robert Pennington); "Buried in Mud: The Coffin Handbill and the Presidential Election of 1828" (Marc Charisse); "Gilson Gardner: A Partisan Reporter in the Election of 1912" (Stephen Ponder); "A Quiet Revolution, 1739-1748: How America's First Three Women Newspaper Editors Treated the Topic of Women" (Julie Hedgepeth); "Partisanship as Social Practice: Seattle and the 'Civil Service Age,' 1915-1919" (James F. Hamilton); "Alice Allison Dunnigan: Pioneer Black Woman Journalist" (Rodger Streitmatter); "Lincoln Steffens and The Commercial Advertiser'" (Peter Parisi); "The Press-Radio War, 1925-1937: A Fight to Protect the Professional Boundaries of Journalism" (Gwenyth Jackaway); "A Rebel By Any Other Name: Herbert Matthews and The New York Times' Coverage of the Battle of Guadalajara" (Aldo Svaldi); "From Journalism History to Labor History: Problems and New Directions in the Labor History of the Newspaper" (Yung-Ho Im); "The Paradox of Samuel Medary, Copperhead Newspaper Publisher" (Reed W. Smith); "An Analysis of a Wartime Agenda: The Korean War Reporting of Marguerite Higgins" (Mary M. Cronin); "Journalism Cultural History: 'Much Ado about Nothing'" (Bonnie Sue Brennen); "A Struggle over Professionalism: Jazz Age Journalism and the Founding of the American Society of Newspaper Editors" (Bruce J. Evensen); " The Most Vindicative and Most Vengeful Power': Labor Confronts the Chicago Newspaper Trust" (Jon Bekken); "Lucrezia Borgia in Albion: Images of Female Criminals c. 1850" (Judith Knelman); and "Subtly Sensational: A Study of Early Victorian Crime Reporting" (Judith Knelman). (MG)

ED323572

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1990 ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATION IN JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION (73rd, Minneapolis, MN, August 1-4, 1990). Part X: Journalism History Studies.

CS507262

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Proceedings 1990
Annual Mtg.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Newspaper Legacy:

E.W. Scripps' Thoughts on Journalism in His Final Years

By Ted Pease
E.W. Scripps School of Journalism
Ohio University

CS507262

Presented to the History Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication at the 1990 AEJMC Convention, Minneapolis, August 9-12.

A Newspaper Legacy:
E.W. Scripps' Thoughts on Journalism in His Final Years

By Ted Pease, Ohio

One look at his earliest existing writing sample – a handwritten, 243-word letter to his beloved older sister, Ellen – tells volumes about the 14-year-old boy who would become E.W. Scripps, the newspaper tycoon: who he was, how he thought and a heavy hint at what he would become and create.

What he became was one of the newspaper giants of the American industrial age. Owner of one of the great newspaper "concerns" of the 20th century, a competitor who went head-to-head with Hearst and Pulitzer, a friend and confidant of presidents, a sponsor and goad of scientists and scholars, a Populist power, and a self-styled friend of the "workingman" who shunned human contact, E.W. Scripps was a complex, talented, arrogant and troubled visionary. During a life of crusading to raise the common man from the clutch of the privileged classes, he may have done as much to form the direction and practice of newspapers as anyone else in U.S. press history.

When he died at 71 in 1926 aboard his 174-foot yacht, the *Ohio*, and was buried at sea off of the coast of Liberia, West Africa, he was a millionaire publisher who controlled some three dozen American newspapers, through which he had spent a lifetime championing the working man. But in 1868, when he wrote to his big sister, "Eddie" was still a small-town Rushville, Ill., boy, though just four years away from the career that would snatch him up and turn a poor immigrant family of "hard-scrabble western Illinois"[1] farmers into one of the most widespread newspaper publishing dynasties in America. By the time he turned 18, in 1872, he was helping his half-brother start the Detroit *Evening News* and, when he was 24, he moved to Cleveland and launched his own paper, the Cleveland *Penny Press*, the beginning of a journalistic empire.

But in 1868, Scripps was a lonely 14-year-old, writing a letter in order to avoid Sunday

---

Pease is a third-year doctoral student in the E.W. Scripps School of Journalism at Ohio University. This article grew out of research for a presentation for the Scripps Symposium at Ohio University in March 1990.

school and exhibiting a talent for journalistic expression that, according to one top Gannett editor, would ensure him a job with USA *Today* in 1990.[2] The letter, covering local events, obituaries, medical news, economic development, public education and family news, is a jewel of concise and direct reportage, presaging an editor whose grasp for what might interest an audience would lead to a giant newspaper "concern." By the 1920s, the Scripps "concern" included 34 newspapers, the United Press, the Newspaper Enterprise Association, the Science News Service and various educational and philanthropic efforts.

"Eddie's" 1868 letter provides insights into his perspectives and personality: concern for family, an eye for detail, a keen appreciation for newsworthiness, a blunt directness, lack of apology and a tendency to let his writing get away from him. It is also the writing of a lonely and frustrated boy who grew into a lonely and easily frustrated man.

In its entirety, including the typos and errors as they appeared in the handwritten original, here is E.W. Scripps' first surviving writing:

Rushvill Ill
Aug 9 1868

Dear Ellen

Ma says I may stay
away from sunday school~~l~~ if I
would write yo~~y~~ a letter and as a think
it is easier to write than go ther Ill try
to do it

they have taen the scafolding off the
~~ch~~ steep~~le~~ and it looks firstrate
pa is having a roof on his barn
sheds

did you knou that we were go
ing to have a brewery and a plaining
mill in town is~~e~~nt Rushvill going
up fast

we had quite a storm thursday night

P S

I forgot to tell you that our
wright ing school has mot
commced yet

P S

I AM TIRD

p s
you must excuse my bad
wrightina I have got a lame
rist and am sleepy

P S
james and hat wont be here
till the midle of september
is n t that mean
P S
the children have got the
hooping cough
P S
Mr klavberg f ell down dad
saturday befor last
P S
juny has got a pup every bod
dy thinks it is ugly but pa ma
and I Ma said I might hav it
Yours afecionately
E W S

P S
can you get us a croquet
book if you could I wish you
would becaus you kow it
will be so long befor james
comes

you fogot to take that need
ell gun to Jessie

you must excuse my having
so many P S' (is that ^ sentens cor
rect) for I wite as I think of
any thing[3]

In these 243 words are 32 misspellings, 73 errors of punctuation (mostly missing punctuation) and eight postscripts. There is also great insight into Scripps' journalistic values and personality. Terse, condensed and pithy, the letter contains at least 10 separate "news briefs" of interest to his reading audience, a prime characteristic of his newspapers. There was news about local landmarks – the church steeple – and about local industry – the new brewery and planing mill ("is~~e~~nt Rushvill going up fast"); there was news that the local "wrighting" school had not yet opened, medical news – "the children have got the hooping cough" – and an obituary – "Mr klavberg fell down dad saturday befor last" – as well as family news about the farm, his siblings and parents.[4]

All in all, Eddie's letter to Ellen in 1868 may come as close to a model for Scripps' newspapering philosophy as exists. Through a newspaper career spanning some 54 years, Scripps developed and maintained an unswerving belief in the role of journalism and newspapers as a friend of the common man – what he called the 95 percent of humanity – in that 95 percent's struggle against the other 5 percent, the privileged classes. From his 1868 letter, through the founding of his first newspapers in Detroit and Cleveland, until his death in 1926, Scripps expressed as a consistent ideal his view of newspapers as public servants.

An examination of more than 2,500 pages of his letters and memoirs, written in the last years of his life, yields an understanding of what might be called Scripps' journalistic morality. In his final years especially, he took pains to spell out his thoughts on journalism: what it is, who does it, what it can do and, perhaps most important, what it should do and be. These expressions of his most basic precepts, central to Scripps' view of newspapering in the 1920s, contain remarkable insights for newspapers in the 1990s as well. From his last writings, particularly from 1922 until his death in 1926, come pronouncements on newspapers that might be grouped under two general headings: First, a newspaper's "soul," its responsibility to serve the public; and, second, the promise and perils of profits – business interests versus journalistic responsibility.

This paper focuses on these themes in Scripps' writings, from his 1868 letter to Ellen, through his first journalistic successes and, particularly, at the end of his life, and also explores why Scripps felt as he did.

• • • • •

Edward Wyllis Scripps was born June 18, 1854, the 13th child of an immigrant British bookbinder who, having failed in plying his trade in London, left England and settled as a farmer in Rushville, Illinois. Scripps was a sickly child, he told an early biographer, "My brother James once told me that I was the most unpromising brat of a baby that he ever knew."[5]

As Negley D. Cochran, Scripps' first biographer who had been one of his best friends and confidants and a top Scripps editor, wrote, "The foundation of E.W. Scripps' success in journalism and business was laid during boyhood on the family farm at Rushville. What he learned there in managing boys, while sitting in a fence corner bossing the job, and reading books, he practiced during the remainder of his life."[6] By Scripps' own account, he had the reputation of being "a very lazy boy, ... the laziest boy in Schuyler County."[7] As he later recalled it, Scripps said he enjoyed this reputation, knowing that he was, in fact, "the most industrious individual" in the region.[8]

About the same time as he wrote the letter to Ellen about the doings in Rushville, Scripps learned one of the keys to what would become a central secret of Scripps journalism. Reading in the attic "boys' room" of the family farmhouse in 1868, the 14-year-old Scripps was interrupted by his half-brother, James, already at 30 a veteran of the Chicago *Tribune* and a top editor and part-owner of the Detroit *Tribune*. Wrote Vance Trimble, another Scripps editor-turned-biographer:

"Squatting down abruptly, James casually took the book from the boy's hand. ' 'The Peter Parley Tales',' he said. 'How well I know these books.' "[9]

James sat beside Scripps on the attic floor and explained to his young half-brother the "secret" hidden in the "Peter Parley" stories, condensed versions of crime, romance and travel, boiled down to simple language, easily understandable. Scripps later recalled:

> As he went on talking it was apparent that he wasn't really thinking about me at all but just thinking out loud. What he said was something like the following: "For some time now I've been thinking that there is something wrong with our American newspapers. They cost too much for poor people to buy. Besides this there is too little in them. They are big papers but filled with long editorials or long articles so that although the papers are big they generally deal with only a very few subjects.
>
> "Now," he said, "I've been thinking for some time about publishing a daily paper on the same plan as has been followed by Peter Parley in his books. ... Parley has condensed all of these stories so that they occupy, each of them, a few pages. Now the paper I have in mind is one that will be filled with very short articles instead of long ones, and which will have many more items of news and many more editorials than our present papers have."[10]

Four years later, in 1972, an 18-year-old Scripps left the farm to join James at the Detroit *Tribune*, where James was a part-owner. Still considering his half-brother an "unpromising brat," James relegated Ed to scut jobs as a $3-a-week office boy. Eventually, the "brat," utilizing the talents of "the laziest boy in Schuyler County" to get others to work for him, evolved into a circulation and subscription whiz.[11]

Shortly after settling into Detroit, on Easter morning in 1873, Scripps later recalled, "A policeman stepped up and spoke to my brother, saying, 'Why Mr. Scripps, don't you know the *Tribune* office burned down this morning?'"[12] It was a total loss. But the fire, Scripps recalled, presented an opportunity for James:

> "Ed, you remember what I said to you when I found you reading Peter Parley's book in the 'Boys' Bedroom'?" I replied that I did and then he went on to speak something as follows: ... "I told you then what I was dreaming about in the way of a new kind of newspaper. I've been dreaming the same dream ever since and now my dream is going to come true. ... It will be a very little one and run very cheaply."[13]

James Scripps based his new paper, the Detroit *Evening News*, on the "Peter Parley" model, as did Scripps himself when he launched the Cleveland *Penny Press* less than five years later, in 1878 – a small, inexpensive paper, filled with short, condensed items of interest to "the average working man." The 4-page *Evening News* would cost 2 cents, compared with the other papers' 5 cents, and would be published in the afternoon, when, James reckoned, more of the city's 20,000 working households would have more time to read. Most important, James told his brother, the *Evening News* would occupy the virgin territory of what he called "popular journalism." James wrote: "There should be papers in which only such things are published as are of interest to the great mass of their readers. They will be useful to all classes who desire to keep up with the news of the day, yet have limited time to look over the papers. ... Emphasize fact, not opinion!"[14] In the *Evening News*' first issue, James told his younger brother, "News matter would be so boiled down that most routine items would be limited to a single paragraph."[15] In an inaugural issue message to his readers on August 23, 1873, James wrote:

> The paper is going to be what its name imports, a plain and faithful picture of what is going on in the great world around us, and especially in our

> immediate vicinity. Nineteenth Century Americans need not have their opinions molded for them by the newspaper press. Give the public the facts and arguments on both sides, and they will quickly determine the right or wrong in each case as it occurs. The *vox populi,* in the long run, will pretty certainly be found to be the *vox Dei.*[16]

This philosophy, reminiscent of Milton's *Aeropagitica*[17] and marketplace-of-ideas theory, was echoed five years later, in 1878, when a 24-year-old E.W. Scripps went to Cleveland to apply the "Peter Parley" principles and duplicate the *Evening News'* success in the *Penny Press.*[18]

Scripps' strongly-held philosophy, like that of his brother, was that newspapers should be beholden to no one, especially not to political or business interests, and that the press's task was simply to inform the public, not to tell readers what to think. In his first edition, Scripps wrote in the *Penny Press* that, "It is no part of a newspaper's business to array itself on the side of this or that party, or [to] fight, lie and wrangle for it. The newspapers should simply present all the facts ... and then, after having discharged its duty as a witness, be satisfied to leave the jury in the case – the public – to find the verdict.[19]

The *Penny Press,* like its Detroit relative, was a 4-page broadsheet of news, advertising and briefs reminiscent of the 1868 letter to Ellen. Like the *Evening News,* the *Penny Press* stressed brevity and universality of appeal across classes – human interest. In addition, the paper's 1-cent price was cheap enough that anyone could afford it, and its delivery timed for evening, when there was more time for the blue-collar, working-class public at which the paper was aimed to read. As Scripps biographer Trimble wrote, the early *Penny Press* had more than a hint of the flavor of Rushville journalism: "Prosaic in appearance and content, the *Penny Press* resembled a sort of friendly news letter, with dashes separating short paragraphs."[20]

In the first issue of the *Penny Press,* the lead column in the upper left of page one contained the following pithy items:

> The viaduct should never be a toll bridge.
>
> \- - -
>
> The prospects for war with Mexico are diminishing.
>
> \- - -
>
> Did you ever see a more beautiful fall than we have had this year?
>
> \- - -
>
> The circulation of the Penny Press will presumably be very large and the advantage its columns will offer to advertisers will be obvious.
>
> \- - -
>
> The insanity dodge failed McGill, and today Cleveland's bench and jury stand higher for this fact in the minds of all lovers of strict justice.[21]

And, like his brother, James, Scripps included in the first issue of the *Penny Press* a blunt declaration of his newspaper's goals and philosophy, demonstrating a keen understanding of his audience and his purpose:

> What the business men want is a newspaper which will present before them all the news of the day in as short and concise a form as possible. They haven't time to spend hours searching thru the length and breadth of a blanket sheet, sifting out of much chaff the few valuable kernels of important news.
>
> What the laborer and the mechanic wants is to be able to get all the information of the large daily papers at a price which he can afford to pay.
>
> What the ladies want is to be able to keep as well posted as their husbands without having to wade thru columns to obtain information that might be placed in a paragraph.
>
> What everybody wants is a daily newspaper at a time convenient for reading, containing all the news of the day, containing not one line of uninteresting matter, and cheap enough so no one will miss the price of it. The Penny Press will supply those wants.[22]

Elsewhere in the 16,000 copies of that first *Penny Press* were "Peter Parley-esque" collections of brief, straightforward and "universal" news. The longest article in the paper was a 1,200-word piece of fiction about a rich man's son and his troubles with his beautiful but unappreciative wife. The story broke at a suspenseful point and promised more in the next issue of the paper, a use of the serial to build and hold readers. Among the other features were "Cleveland Characteristics," a "Personal" column and "Mercantile Notes," which included commodity prices and the best places in town to purchase inexpensive apples, dressed hogs, flour and coal.

Under "Reporters' Pickings" was a series of the kind of concise, locally-based news items of community interest on which Scripps based all of his papers. Running down the column, separated by ellipses, were items of local interest such as:

> Twenty-nine marriage licenses have been granted during the week. ... Will Payne Avenue ever be graded and paved? It is now in an impassable condition. ... The city treasurer's office was filled this morning with school marms drawing their pay. ... St. Peter's church, corner of Superior and Dodge, will soon be repainted and two cupolas added to the roof. ... What will reporters for the big papers do now that the baseball season has ended? They will have nothing to write about. ... Market Master Beck confiscated about 15 carcasses of veal at the Central Market this morning owing to the fact that they were entirely unfit for food. ... A fire occurred at 105 Spring street at 7:20 o'clock this morning, caused by sparks falling on the roof of the building. Loss was not serious. ... Fears are entertained that the little steamer Morning Star, which left port for Canada a week ago for a load of ice, is lost because she has not been heard from since leaving.[23]

It was community journalism at its best. As in Detroit, editors of the established Cleveland papers were more amused than threatened by the newcomer, except for one, E.B.

Smalley, editor of the Cleveland *Herald*. "Young man," he told a *Herald* office boy, "here is a new and far-reaching move in journalism."[24] He was right.

Scripps' Newspaper Philosophy

Throughout Scripps' career, his keen appreciation for what his blue-collar, "working man" public expected from a newspaper evolved into a paternalistic concern for the "common man." Starting with his avowed goal of founding a group of 100 or so small newspapers, Scripps actually did start or buy more than 40 newspapers between November 1878 and the birth of the *Penny Press* and his death in 1926. Just two years before his death at 71, Scripps still wrote of his plans for "20 or 30" new Southern papers, based on his original credo of producing news for the common people at an affordable price.

Although Scripps was known as a skinflint whose concern for saving money and the bottom line was legendary, and although his greatest talent probably was for business and management, Scripps' real devotion to newspapers lay on the editorial, not the business, side. As he neared the end of his life, having passed responsibility for the Scripps "concern" to his son, Robert, and other younger men, Scripps in his volumnious letters used his retirement to exercise an unceasingly active mind.

In his more than 2,500 pages of essays and letters to family, friends and business associates, as well as to editors, scholars, scientists and presidents, Scripps took the time to sketch out a philosophy of journalism that had begun with the "Peter Parley Tales" in the attic of his family's Rushville farmhouse and never much deviated from the course he set in Cleveland in the early days.

In earlier letters, while he was still active in directing the affairs of the far-flung Scripps concerns, Scripps had written chiefly of business, politics and economic trends, and relatively little of his ideas on what newspapers should be. In the last six years of his life, however, Scripps withdrew from his family troubles and business concerns, spending nearly all of the period 1922 through 1926 on his yachts, the 96-foot *Kemah* and the larger *Ohio*, cruising the world to escape the pressures and sadness of his family. Estranged from all but his son, Robert, who had taken over as editor-in-chief of the Scripps newspapers with business manager Roy W. Howard in 1920, and from his beloved older sister, Ellen, Scripps took to the sea to avoid conflict and to find solace in the open expanses of ocean, and in the world of his own thoughts in his yacht's 3,000-volume library.

Revealed in Scripps' last writings, particularly in the period from 1922 through March 1926, are philosophies of the role of the press that echo his earliest journalism, both in the 1868 letter and in his first newspapering days in Detroit and Cleveland. At the end of his life, Scripps was able to enunciate as a philosophy, the journalistic standards by which he had lived for almost 50 years as a newspaperman.

In the final years of a rich, tumultuous and often contentious life, E.W. Scripps in his letters seemed to be a man losing heart, losing contact with his family and his fortune, and largely estranged from both. To his last day aboard the yacht *Ohio*, off the coast of Liberia in 1926, however, one thing that Scripps clutched close and firm was his unwavering view of newspapers' responsibility toward society, toward government and toward what he fondly called "the working man."

In his final days, he was sadly disappointed in what newspapers in the 1920s had become, and it is from this disappointment and his own diagnosis of the reasons for his dissatisfactions with the press that historians and journalists can draw some lessons and some warnings in 1990. In the hundreds of pages of Scripps' letters written from late 1917 through March 1926, a picture of the man emerges – a man in mourning and lonely for the family that should surround him in his final years, but from whom he was cut off. He was a man who, fearful for the continued health of the "institution" he had founded, worried at length and in great detail about its financial prospects, particularly in view of the loss of the Western papers – his "children," as he called them – which had been "pirated" by his eldest son, James.

Despite his lifelong business successes, Scripps' personal life was less than harmonious. A habitual womanizer and heavy drinker – he bragged that, at periods, he consumed a gallon of whiskey a day[25] – Scripps resolved in 1883 to settle down, marrying in 1885.

By 1920, however, estranged from his wife, daughter and eldest son, James, Scripps was physically unwell and emotionally weary. He was a man who took great pains to separate himself in these waning years from any information about business or the family that might depress him, and yet who was depressed that his wife, daughters and daughter-in-law shunned him, and that his grandsons had been lost to him. He was a man who boasted in his letters to U.S. presidents and to college presidents, to scientists and to scholars, that his newspapers were perhaps the most influential group in the nation, reaching – he claimed variously in letters – anywhere from 40 percent to 70 percent of the American public. At the same time, in an essay titled "What A Penny Did For Me" in early 1923, Scripps wondered what might have been, whether he might not have had a "far happier life" had he been less successful.[26]

Newspapers' Responsibility to Public Service

Amidst this load of contradictions and internal conflicts that beset a man who wanted company – and yet who chose to take to the seas for months at a time in order to avoid it – there remained to the end some basic and unswerving precepts of journalism, which Scripps expressed forcefully and passionately to the end.

Throughout his career, Scripps was known as a champion of the working man, a journalist who proudly said he not only understood his public, but could communicate with and motivate them.

As he told a meeting of his editors in Washington in 1922, "The mission of journalism is public service. I have striven all my life to render such public service."[27] Public service was central to Scripps' vision of what newspapers could and should be. Further, with this kind of public service, he wrote, came both power and heavy responsibility. In 1925, in a lengthy essay (he called these "disquisitions") on the responsibilities of journalism, delivered to an imaginary college class of would-be newspapermen, he said: "In reality, journalism is statesmanship. The government of such a democracy as ours is, is practically a government of newspapers. ... What the public knows it learns through the newspaper. Whatever the bias of the public mind, it is largely the result of newspaper writers."[28]

No other influence in American society carried with it such power to channel the thinking of the public, he said:

> The teachers in our public schools and colleges, the ministers who preach sermons in our churches, the orators who address public meetings, all exercise more or less influence in moulding the minds of the people, but all of these influences are slight compared to the mighty force of the daily press.... What do men know of men and events in the world, what can they know except what they learn from our newspapers?[29]

The issue of newspapers' power arose, Scripps wrote, in the question of the journalist's ability to lead and to mold an ignorant and largely uninvolved public. Scripps felt that politicians in power in the 1920s were where they were in no small part because of the intercession of the Scripps newspapers and of Scripps himself.

From aboard his yacht, *Kemah*, anchored in Miami in 1918, he wrote: "As one of the great leaders of the press in this country, I feel a large part of the responsibility for all those men holding the official positions that they do."[30] But he added a month later that he was not always comfortable with the press holding that responsibility: "The government of the United States today is largely a government by newspapers," he wrote. "If we newspaper men are not, actually, 'blind leaders of the blind', we are seldom well enough equipped with knowledge and wisdom to be the best kind of leaders of public opinion."[31]

Further, as he wrote his son, Robert, in 1920, because ours is a government of newspapers, "I have considered [newspapers] rather as institutions of public service and all the individuals who are a part of the institution as elected officers or servants to the public."[32]

With this power to influence society, Scripps said in 1917, came great responsibility: "A long time ago, I adopted, as a rule of my journalism, 'When in doubt about any public subject, tell the people.'"[33] But he later qualified this dictum, indicating the paternalistic strain in his attitudes toward "the working man" that, if anything, increased with age. Newspapers, Scripps thought, were in a ticklish situation of serving a society that desperately needed knowledge but was resistant to it, a public that must be fooled and tricked if journalists were to fulfill their responsibility to lead.

Writing to Edwin Slosson of the Science Service in 1920, he said:

> My nearly fifty years' journalistic experience has taught me two things:
>
> First, that the public so resents preachments and instruction, that the really skillful and effective journalist must impart facts and opinions without being suspected of trying to get anything over.
>
> Second, that the public is so lazy that it cannot endure more words than exactly enough.[34]

This imperious attitude seems in contrast to the image of E.W. Scripps, friend of the "working man." In fact, however, he was in large part a product of his times. Wealthy, well-meaning, opinionated, paternalistic and far removed from those "working men" he had so long sought to champion, Scripps saw his own mission, and that of the press, as one of lifting the masses from their ignorance into the light of truth.

Newspaper men such as himself, he wrote to Dr. William Ritter of the Scripps

Oceanographic Institution in 1920,

> are at least trying to open the minds of the densely ignorant and thoughtless masses – so that there will at least be a way open or a road made into these minds which can be later traveled by such exquisites of intelligence as our Association for the Popular Dissemination of Science. ...
>
> Don't overlook that we have already advanced half of the way between dullness and ignorant stupidity and immorality, toward the throne of wisdom.
>
> If you are going to teach knowledge and wisdom to the people you must learn that which you are at present densely ignorant of, and that is the real nature of the mass of humanity. No matter how filthy-minded, how corrupt, how diseased of mind and body, this public is, it is your place and mine and the fellows of our association to be humble and diligent in our research, patient and self-sacrificing and cease to be what most of us are – Pharisees who are thanking God that we are not as other men are.[35]

This missionary fervor, though more than tinged with elitism and classism, seems to have been genuine, and is consistent with his earliest journalistic precepts, formed on his first newspaper in Cleveland more than 40 years before; E.W. Scripps saw it as newspapers' sacred responsibility to enlighten the people, to lead them, to tell them the truth. "In fact," he wrote in 1917, "I hold that a newspaper is in the same position towards the public as a witness is in court. Both are bound to 'tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.'"[36]

But he tempered that standard in 1925. "That honesty in journalism is the best policy you might all reasonably doubt," he said. "However, I think none of us have reason to doubt that honesty is a good enough policy, though, at times, because we are all frail human beings, the best that most of us can do is to be as honest as we can afford to be."[37]

Getting that "truth" over to a resistant public, however, presented difficulties, as Scripps acknowledged to his hypothetical class of journalism students in 1925:

> Men and women do not like being preached at and taught and the moment

> that the average reader finds under his eyes some article intended to instruct and guide his or her opinion, he or she will skip that article to read something else.
>
> If we do not amuse and entertain our readers we will have few readers or none at all. We will have no audience listening to us.
>
> As patriots and altruists it is our business to improve the public mind in the only way possible. In order to instruct the people we must conceal as far as we can our intention to do so. We must slyly insinuate into the baser sorts of minds lessons that will be valuable to them and facts upon which they will be compelled to base their judgments .... We must keep our audience interested, whatever else we do, and then craftily work upon their minds.[38]

And who were these defenders of society, the journalists who were most effective in leading the working man? Scripps recalled in 1922:

> The man who carried the Cleveland *Press* through was a $15-a-week, morphine-eating, whiskey-drunk reporter. ... It was a wild-eyed, eccentric, ex-Methodist minister who had been excommunicated, who did more to make the Cincinnati *Post* a success than all the rest of us put together.... I think the really great editor is the man who can secure and keep on his staff one, two, or three writers whom he permits to express themselves with the least possible restraint.[39]

And yet, observing the reading habits of his ace reporter, Gilson Gardner, aboard his yacht, *Kemah*, in 1922, Scripps worried that newspapermen "do no really serious hard thinking. Perhaps for this reason they are so thoroughly good newspaper men," he wrote to his sister, Ellen. "If we have to have a government by newspapers, it is going to be very unfortunate if our newspaper makers are primarily novel readers and moving picture fans."[40]

The Perils of Profit

The public servant, a co-equal of government in the task of directing and leading the public, was doubtless E.W. Scripps' dearest image of the press, and of himself. At the same time, however, he was a businessman. And, as such, he had a keen understanding of the morality of money. While resisting and resenting newspaper men whose primary purpose was profit – the issue over which he and his son, James, broke[41] – Scripps told his editors in a conference in Washington in 1922 that, "First and foremost, in the conduct of this institution, you must remember that your income must be greater than your outgo."[42]

The reason was typically simple and commonsensical: A newspaper that loses money dies, losing also the ability to fulfill its social responsibility. Although there clearly were great fortunes to be made in newspapering, the Scripps morality held that, the greater the fortune, the greater the responsibility. In a reflective essay titled "Self-Questioning" in July 1925 – eight months before he died – Scripps wrote, "A newspaper owner whose sole object in his profession in business is to acquire money cannot be a gentleman. He cannot be honest. He cannot be anything else than a more or less vicious man."[43] How might latter-day newspaper owners respond to such an assessment?

At the end of his life, Scripps found himself ashamed of the big business that newspapering had become. Throughout his tenure as he built his empire, he had seen profits as a means to an end. Now, he thought, it was the other way around: profits had become the goal, and journalism the mere means to the end.

In his 1925 "The Wisdom of an Old Penman," an essay in which he addressed the imaginary class of would-be journalists, Scripps drew these lines clearly:

> Gentlemen, the problem with journalism is its hermaphrodotic character. It isn't all a profession, and it isn't all a business. Perhaps originally, a few decades ago, journalism was a profession much more than it is now. Men practiced the profession for the love of it or for the love of the little or large influence or power that the calling brought with it. ...
>
> The newspaper business has actually become what is called 'big business.' Newspapers have become or are at least becoming recognized by the public as properties rather than as organs of public opinion.[44]

Scripps despaired that newspapers, in pursuing profit over content, had lost their purpose. "There was a time in this country when newspapers were run for the purpose of moulding public opinion and their owners were deemed lucky if they gained an incidental profit. Now newspapers are run for profit and only incidentally are moulders of public opinion, leaders of the people in politics, and teachers."[45] This was a potentially fatal failing, Scripps thought: "Why gentlemen, journalism is business pure and simple. ... [and] dollar chasing is anything but an enobling pursuit."[46]

In another essay he called "Forecasting," written in 1925, he wrote: "I think that the greater the success of the [Scripps] concern will be, the worse it will be for the people of the United States. I think it is bad for journalism that dollar chasing shall be its main pursuit."[47]

In a 1924 letter to his sister, Ellen, his best and closest friend, he despaired that the noble endeavor that had been journalism was becoming tainted by the profit. He wrote:

> This wholesale production of newspapers – I am beginning to be convinced – is not a good thing for the public, or even for the men who are producing them. And yet I am the inventor! – the originator of this very practice!
>
> I do not object wholly or perhaps even in part to the idea of making money, and large money, out of journalism.
>
> What I do object to is the prevailing opinion in journalism today that the only object of running a newspaper today is to make money.[48]

For E.W. Scripps, the self-styled protector of the public, business and editorial functions of a newspaper were inextricably intertwined: Without business, there could be no revenue, and without revenue, there could be no newspaper. At the same time, however, without a newspaper whose content drew readers, there could be no circulation, and without circulation there could be no profits, and no business. The danger, he cautioned his feuding sons, James and Robert, in 1919, was that a newspaper's business interests might overcome its journalistic interests, and, in so doing, the newspaper risked losing its soul: "So soon as a newspaper owner holds his newspaper as property, the fate and doom of that newspaper owner are sealed," he wrote. "A physician who would kill or cure for money, or a statesman who would betray his country for a bribe, might succeed in evading exposure; but the false journalist can never hide his faults."[49]

Conclusions

These lessons, hard-learned by E.W. Scripps in the 1920s, may be object lessons for journalism today in the 1990s. He complained in 1925 that, "I think the greatest blemish on the American press today is the likeness of the newspapers, taken as a whole, each to another, and of all the writings in any single publication."[55]

And how might Scripps have viewed American newspapers of 1990?

The reason for that sameness in the American press of 1925, Scripps said, could be traced to the transformation of journalism, once a noble profession, into a bottom-line business. Scripps perceived a dangerous balance between "Scylla and Charybdis" – between business and journalism, between excessive concentration on profit on the one hand, and too much attention to a newspaper's public servant role on the other. Maintaining and nurturing this balance, Scripps thought, was the only route to a newspaper's survival and health. Newspapers, if they are to be healthy, cannot afford the luxury of too much weight on either side of the business-journalism fulcrum.

Rather, he said, newspapers must survive without either selling their souls, or giving them away. The result of such balance, we might conclude, would be journalism such as E.W. Scripps practiced in his 1868 letter about news in Rushville, or in the columns of his blue-collar Cleveland *Penny Press* – direct, wide-open, honest and to the point, news about things the "common people" might be interested in, stated in a way they can understand and use, and at a price that they can afford.

Notes

1. Vance H. Trimble, *Scripps: An Astonishing Life!* early unpublished draft of *The Astonishing Mr. Scripps.* (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, November 1990) p. 1:4.
2. John Seigenthaler, speech to the "Scripps Symposium: A Celebration of the Legacies of E.W. Scripps: His Life, Works & Heritage," Ohio University, Athens, Ohio March 3, 1990.
3. E.W. Scripps letter to Ellen B. Scripps, August 9, 1868.
4. Scripps probably had written letters prior to this one. But of the surviving Scripps papers – including those of Ellen Browning Scripps held by Scripps College in California, and the 350,000-page collection of E.W. Scripps' own papers, unveiled at Ohio University in March 1990 – this is the earliest example.
5. Negley D. Cochran, *E.W. Scripps.* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1933) p. 6.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
7. *Ibid.* For details on Scripps' early life, see especially Trimble, *op. cit.*, and also Oliver Knight, ed., *I Protest: Selected disquisitions of E.W. Scripps.* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969); Gilson Gardner, *Lusty Scripps: The Life of E.W. Scripps, (1854-1926).* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1932); Charles T. McCabe, ed., *Damned Old Crank: A Self-Portrait of E.W. Scripps Drawn from his Unpublished Writings.* (New York: Harper & Row, 1951).
8. *Ibid.*
9. Trimble, *op. cit.*, pp. 2:22-24
10. E.W. Scripps, "The Whirligig of Time," diary notes dictated "Aboard Yacht 'Ohio', At Sea," September 6, 1924, pp. 4-5.
11. Scripps went to work selling subscriptions to the new Detroit *Evening News.* Soon, the "laziest boy in Schuyler County" had sold more than 2,000 subscriptions and had scores of boys working for him, effectively controlling approximately 10 percent of the paper's total circulation. At one point, behind in his payments to the newspaper, Scripps and the paper's business manager got into a fight, with Scripps threatening to quit, a move that would have cut the total circulation and jeopardized advertising rates. See Trimble, *op. cit.*
12. E.W. Scripps, "Whirligig of Time," *op. cit.*, p. 5.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
14. Cyril Arthur Player, *The Story of James Edward Scripps*, unpublished manuscript, (Cranbrook Archives, Detroit), p. 113. Cited in Trimble, *op. cit.*
15. Trimble, *op. cit.*, p. 4:3.
16. Cited in Player, *op. cit.*, p. 142. (August 23, 1873, p. 1).
17. John Milton, writing in England in 1644, made an impassioned plea for free expression and free press in his *Areopagitica:* "Give me liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties," he wrote. Elsewhere in *Areopagitica*, he wrote, "And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter?" In their messages to the public in the first editions of their newspapers in Detroit and Cleveland, James and E.W. Scripps expressed the same sentiment – "Give the public the facts and arguments on both sides, and they will quickly determine the right and wrong." (James Scripps in the Detroit *Evening News*, Vol. 1, No. 1, August 23, 1873, p. 1) and, "The newspapers should present all the facts ... and then, after having discharged its duty as a witness, be satisfied to leave the jury in the case – the public – to find the verdict." (E.W. Scripps, in the Cleveland *Penny Press*, Vol. 1, No. 1, November 2, 1878, p. 1)
18. Within 14 months of its founding, the *Penny Press* was out of debt and turning a profit, testimony – Scripps thought – to his business acument. See Trimble, *op. cit.*, p. 4:3.
19. The Cleveland *Penny Press*, Vol. 1, No. 1, November 2, 1878, p. 1.
20. Trimble, *op. cit.*, p. 6:15.
21. The Cleveland *Penny Press*, Vol. 1, No. 1, November 2, 1878, p. 1.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
23. *Ibid.*, "Reporters' Pickings"
24. *The Cleveland Press 50th Anniversary Edition*, November 1, 1928. Cited in Trimble, *op. cit.*, p. 6:21.
25. Vance H. Trimble, ed., *Faith in My Star*, (Memphis: The E.W. Scripps Co., 1989), p. 109. Selection is from

Scripps' unpublished *History of the Scripps League*, @ 1872-78.
26. E.W. Scripps, "What a Penny Did for Me," February 16, 1923, p. 12.
27. E.W. Scripps, Speech to the Editorial Conference, Washington, D.C., May 24, 1922, p. 2.
28. E.W. Scripps, "The Wisdom of an Old Penman," June 1, 1925, p. 6.
29. *Ibid.*
30. E.W. Scripps letter to Professor Irving Fisher, Yale University, from aboard the *Kemah* at Miami, November 23, 1918, p. 4.
31. E.W. Scripps letter to Professor Irving Fisher, Yale University, from aboard the *Kemah* at Miami, December 18, 1918, p. 3.
32. E.W. Scripps letter to Robert Paine Scripps in Cleveland, from Miramar, Calif., November 29, 1920, p. 3.
33. E.W. Scripps letter to F.A. Davidson, Cincinnati, from Washington, D.C., August 6, 1917.
34. E.W. Scripps letter to Edwin E. Slosson, Science Service, Washington, D.C., from Miramar, Calif., August 28, 1920, p.1.
35. E.W. Scripps letter to Dr. William E. Ritter, Scripps Oceanographic Institution, San Diego, from Birmingham, Ala., November 24, 1921, p. 5.
36. E.W. Scripps letter to F.A. Davidson, Cincinnati, from Washington, D.C., August 6, 1917.
37. E.W. Scripps, "The Wisdom of an Old Penman," *op. cit.*, p. 10.
38. *Ibid.*, p 7.
39. E.W. Scripps, "Concerning the Founding of New Newspapers," dictated aboard *Kemah* in Virginia, April 23, 1922, pp. 6-7.
40. E.W. Scripps letter to Ellen B. Scripps, March 27, 1922, p. 6.
41. In 1907, when Scripps was 53 and his eldest son, James, turned 21, Scripps turned over to his son his power-of-attorney and set the boy to work as the head of the Scripps "concern." By 1916, however, James and his father were locked in a struggle for power over the "concern," and Scripps revoked his power-of-attorney from james in favor of his youngest son, Robert, whom he appointed editor-in-chief of the entire newspaper chain. Over the next three years, James and Robert's conflict became more and more open, with the old man siding with his younger son. In 1920, James quit, taking with him controlling stock of nine of the Western Scripps papers, splitting the "concern." The "pirated" Western Scripps papers of which James G. Scripps took control in June 1920 after his break with his father and that were controlled after his death in 1921 by his widow, Josephine Scripps, were: The Los Angeles *Record*, the Seattle *Star*, the Spokane *Press*, the Tacoma *Times*, the San Francisco *News*, the Sacramento *Star*, the Portland *Press*, the Denver *Express* and the Dallas *Dispatch*. Robert Scripps, meanwhile, paired with Roy W. Howard as business manager of the "concern," came into his own, and the company underwent a burst of expansionism in the early 1920s. For E.W. Scripps, however, the years of family squabbles had become too much to bear. When he took to the sea in 1920, he rarely returned ashore.
42. Speech to the Editorial Conference, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
43. E.W. Scripps, "Self Questioning," dictated in Baltimore, July 20, 1925, p.3.
44. E.W. Scripps, "The Wisdom of an Old Penman," *op. cit.*, p. 4.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.
46. *Ibid.*
47. E.W. Scripps, "Forecasting," dictated aboard the yacht *Ohio*, June 6, 1925, p. 8.
48. E.W. Scripps letter to Ellen B. Scripps, June 1, 1924, p. 3.
49. E.W. Scripps letter to James G. Scripps & Robert P. Scripps in San Diego, from Miramar, September 1, 1919, p. 4.
50. E.W. Scripps, "The Wisdom of an Old Penman," *op. cit.*, p. 9.

# # #

The Great War of Words Between the United States and Mexico:
Public and Private Communications of the U.S. Government During World War I

© 1990 Robert Pennington
University of Oklahoma

A Paper presented at the convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, History Division

Traditionally, nations have conducted relations through formal diplomatic channels. Messages passed between nations are usually seen only by government officials, whose business it is to tend to the public affairs of the nations, and not by ordinary citizens, who are not involved in the day-to-day dealings between governments. Yet as the concept of elected government--legitimated by the citizenry--gained acceptance, citizens acquired a need to know more details about foreign relations and how citizens' lives are affected. In a democratic society, citizens need such information about government activities in order to make their own political choices. Such information is supposed to be open and honest to the extent that its publication would not threaten national security.

As public officials become more accountable to voters, they develop various means of maintaining favorable images for the voters. Sometimes the favorable image has been simply that of a politician with enough clout to spread favors or to get things done for constituents. Other times the image may be that of honesty and integrity, or other qualities that citizens have been told are desirable in public officials. Intranationally, one candidate, party or faction will present a certain image in hope of gaining or maintaining influence or control. Opposing candidates, parties or factions will do likewise. Assuming that elections are reasonably honest, the voting citizens will decide among the candidates, parties or factions and the more appealing among them will prevail. Internationally, citizens do not choose between the competing governments of two or more sovereign nations. The reconciliation of differences takes place through diplomatic or military activities. The more powerful or intimidating of the governments tends to prevail.

But with the advent of mass communication, it has become possible for a government to exert influence on another government through other than formal diplomatic channels. Democratic governments are supposed to represent the views of their citizens. If this be the case, then to influence the policy of a government, it is necessary to influence the perceptions of its constituent citizens. A unified effort of formal diplomatic communication coupled with public mass communication directed toward the citizenry is a two-tiered approach to achieve maximum effect. However, when a government presents one message publicly and another privately, the effect of its efforts must be diminished.

During the first world war, the U. S. government tried to project an image of readiness and uprightness not only to its own citizens, but to citizens of many foreign nations as well. The U. S. government made a particularly strong effort in Mexico. Because of its strategic location and its valuable mineral resources, it was vitally important to the United States that Mexico be pro-Ally or at least neutral--anything but pro-German. The governments of the United States and Mexico, however, did not have the most cordial of relations. Mexico had been going through a revolutionary stage and had adopted a new constitution that threatened to do away with the generous economic climate for foreign investment. U.S. troops had been in Mexico for extended periods during the the revolution in order to protect U.S. commercial interests and to punish Mexicans for raids across the U.S. border. In short, the United States had an image problem in Mexico. Similarly, Mexico had an image problem in the United States.

The government of the United States undertook to improve its image through mass communication, but the private diplomatic communication that was taking place at the same time undermined the public efforts because the tenor of the private communication was the opposite of the public communication. Among its image building activities, the U.S. government invited Mexican journalists to tour the United States. Some Mexican critics saw the tour as an attempt by the United States to use Mexican journalists. But the Mexican political chief urged the journalists to participate, and upon their return the journalists themselves felt their trip had improved Mexico's image in the United States. During the tour, the journalists met with President Wilson, who gave new meaning to the Monroe Doctrine. Mexican newspapers printed his message. But the Mexican political chief, Venustiano Carranza, ordered that the papers also print a formal message from the U.S. Department of State that reflected the old interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Overview

When the United States entered World War I, President Woodrow Wilson, who had preached so strongly in favor of neutrality, created the Committee on Public Information (CPI) to generate support for his foreign policy. It was the job of the committee to disseminate information in such a way as to guide the public toward a favorable attitude with respect to U.S. involvement in the war. Domestic support was essential to the successful execution of the war effort. Foreign support was a strategic necessity. For that reason, the committee had both domestic and foreign operations. The communication efforts of the committee in Mexico are contrasted with the diplomatic communication in this study because of the strategic importance of Mexico to the German Empire as a way to keep the United States out of the war in Europe, and because of the cold, often hostile, relations between the United States and Mexico before, during and after the war.

The target of the committee's activities was the Mexican people, a fact revealing key assumptions of committee members and administration officials: that to affect the attitudes of the people is to affect the attitude of the country. They assumed the media to have powerful persuasive affects. The United States needed more than a little good press in

Mexico. The history of the two countries was uneven. Several military clashes had occurred, and Mexico had lost much of its territory. Less than a year before being sent to France, General Pershing had been in northern Mexico with an expeditionary force. Rather than appeal to the educated, reading, thoughtful part of the populace that tended to distrust the United States because of the traditionally stormy relations between the two countries, the committee in Mexico targeted their messages to the "densely ignorant population."[1]

The director of the CPI Mexico section did not expect to accomplish much or to influence public sentiment, but merely to keep up with the Germans. Not only did the section keep up with the Germans, it went further. Films were widely distributed.. Later, reading rooms were established, as well as classes to teach people reading and other skills. News was distributed. Private U.S. corporations were enlisted to place their advertising in the more sympathetic publications. Daily and weekly bulletins were published for Mexican readers. Realizing that many of the problems between the U.S. and Mexico were owing to ignorance in both countries, the committee began publishing a weekly bulletin about Mexico for U.S. readers.

Mexican journalists, likely to be included in the educated, reading, thoughtful part of the population that tended to distrust the United States, received the information proffered by the committee with appreciation, since it was free, but also with a healthy skepticism. It would be impossible, of course, to get any good press from hostile editors and journalists. In some cases, notably that of *El Demócrata*, the committee considered a publication to be so intransigently anti-American that no information was offered to it, and advertising boycotts were urged. The committee hoped to win better treatment in the Mexican press by inviting editors and journalists from major newspapers to tour the United States.

The United States had been involved in the war for almost a year before the committee established a section in Mexico. During that time German propagandists had been spreading disinformation about U.S. readiness and public support. On their tour of the United States, the Mexican journalists were shown shipyards, stockyards and munitions plants, listened to and gave some speeches. One editor explained that the concern over German propaganda was greater than it ought to have been. Another explained that in war, the loyalties of Mexicans tend to lie with other Latins, such as French and Italian, rather than non-Latins, such as German and English. A highlight of the tour was a meeting with President Wilson during which he explained his position concerning Mexico and the rest of Latin America.

---

[1] James R. Mock and Cedric Larson. *Words that Won the War: The Story of the Committee on Public Information 1917-1919.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939), p. 323.

At Wilson's request, the text of the speech to the journalists was published in Mexico and the rest of Latin America before it was published in the United States. The *New York Times* correspondent in Havana wired a portion of the speech to his newspaper for publication. It was an idealistic speech about hemispheric brotherhood, but with one brother bigger than the others. Wilson said the only reason the United States had sent troops into Mexico was to protect the rights and interests of real Mexicans. He regretted having had to send the troops and explained that the United States had no intention of violating the sovereignty of Mexico or any other Latin American nation. Generally, newspapers throughout Latin America either praised the speech or spoke with cautious enthusiasm. But in Mexico, the government released other communication that put Wilson's sincerity in serious doubt, and brought to light another level of international communication.

Mexico was going through revolution, upsetting the relations between that country and the United States, and causing the United States to break diplomatic relations. Venustiano Carranza emerged as political leader of Mexico, but the United States did not consider his government sufficiently stable or his policies acceptable. The German ambassador to the United States tried unsuccessfully to coax the United States into military action in Mexico, in order to keep the United States out of the European theater. Toward that end, the German secretary of state instructed his minister in Mexico to make an offer of alliance with Mexico in the event that the United States entered the war. Two weeks after the United States received the intercepted message, Henry P. Fletcher presented his credentials to Carranza as Ambassador of the United States.

Diplomatic relations did not mean good relations. Former Mexican governments had allowed, even encouraged, what Carranza and his supporters considered to be the plunder of Mexican resources. A new constitution adopted in 1917, which in many respects was too liberal for Carranza, provided that ownership of land only pertained to the surface, that minerals or other resources below the surface and water flowing across the surface were publicly owned. It was up to the Mexican Congress to pass laws to implement the constitution, but the United States, Britain, Germany and other countries with interests in Mexico did not want the constitution implemented. In addition, President Carranza had issued decrees which threatened the viability of foreign investments and operations. The diplomatic communications surrounding the "Mexican Problem" express policy incompatible with the policy articulated in Wilson's speech to the visiting Mexican journalists.

Carranza used that speech as an example of Wilson's duplicity, questioning Wilson's trustworthiness. He ordered that an official protest to the Mexican government, received from the United States several weeks earlier, be printed with the text of Wilson's speech. The protest carried a very thinly veiled threat of military intervention if the provisions of a certain decree were carried out. A newspaper considered to share Carranza's views reminded readers in an editorial that Wilson had until recently been an outspoken proponent of neutrality, then he involved the United States in the war. Wilson spoke of hemispheric brotherhood and cooperation while his state department threatened military action if Mexico did not conduct its internal affairs in a manner acceptable to the United States. Carranza did not have access to diplomatic communications, which were not relayed to his government, indicating that the U.S. secretary of state was prepared to make his threats even stronger and more explicit. They are unlikely to have made any difference. Carranza was either willing to go to war with the United States, as he regretfully told the U.S. ambassador, or he was willing to call the bluff of the U.S. secretary.

The Mexican section of the Committee on Public Information was not aware of the diplomatic communication until it was published in the newspapers. Diplomatic messages were assumed by U.S. officials to be confidential. When the protest showed up in Mexican newspapers, Ambassador Fletcher was shocked. The appearance of both the speech and the protest illustrated the aims of the Wilson administration in using the Committee on Public Information. The committee was instituted to censor information about the United States and the war effort in order to give the United States and its administration the best possible appearance. Wilson's speech to the Mexican journalists set forth the policy that the administration wanted Mexicans and other Latin Americans to perceive. The formal protest is one of several documents that show the policy that actually existed. The public communications of the committee were at odds with and subverted by the private diplomatic communications of the state department, prehaps reflecting the hostility between CPI chairman George Creel and Secretary of State Lansing.

Within weeks of the armistice, the Committee on Public Information was dismantled. Its mission had been the censorship of information during the war. When the war ended, the purpose for which the committee was created no longer existed. The staff in Mexico wanted to continue the work that they had started in the areas education and information exchanges such as reading rooms and classes in language and business skills, but appeals to continue such work were not considered. Years later, during the Roosevelt administration, the Office fo War Information (OWI) was created to do similar work,[2] but it was too late to save the committee from the reputation of having been simply a propaganda tool. Indeed, CPI served as a model of what to avoid in the OWI.[3]

Indeed it had been a propaganda tool, but in setting up operations the committee had been careful to avoid the appearance of being such a tool. The nature of the committee's work had been exposed to all of literate Mexico when Carranza ordered that the U.S. protest be published. Denying information, even cutting off information, to pro-German publications was also part of the the operation of the committee in Mexico that showed the nature of the work, but not as clearly. George Creel wrote that through its wire service, Compub, CPI never departed from the presentation of facts, but never admitted that the presentation of facts can be subjective or self-serving.[4] In the supply of information, often the comparison is between what one source says and what another source says. Between Wilson's speech and the State Department protest, the comparison was between two incompatible messages from the same source.

Diplomatic Relations

The U.S. government was reluctant to recognize the government of Venustiano Carranza, hoping for a coalition of leaders of the Constitutionalist party or a single leader other than one of the Constitutionalist party leaders. But after Carranza had established a degree of military supremacy, the Wilson administration entertained hopes that he would "insure order, adhere to the principles of capitalism, and frustrate the aims of German imperialism."[5] Relations with Germany were the first consideration regulating the relations of the U.S. government with Mexico. Secretary of State Lansing knew that Germany wanted the turmoil in Mexico to continue until the U.S. government was forced to intervene. In order to have the turmoil continue, Germany did not want to have one faction dominant in Mexico. Furthermore, if the U.S. government recognized any Mexican government, Germany would seek to cause a quarrel between the U.S. and Mexican governments. Therefore, it was Lansing's position that the United States not intervene, not recognize one faction as dominant, and avoid a quarrel no matter how great the criticism from Congress or the press.[6]

---

[2] Emily S. Rosenberg. *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945*. (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982), pp. 206-9.

[3] Allan M. Winkler *The Politics of Propaganda*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), pp. 5, 20, 29, 34.

[4] ibid., p. 86.

[5] Mark T. Gilderhaus. *Diplomacy and Revolution: U.S.-Mexican Relations under Wilson and Carranza*. (Tucson, Arizona: the University of Arizona Press, 1977), p. 31.

Before the 1910 revolution, foreign businesses from all countries had enjoyed considerable favor investing in Mexico. The country was not as much a market for foreign products as it was a source of valuable raw materials. The attitude of Carranza was to take back Mexico for Mexicans. The constitution that was written in 1917 provides for the nationalization of all subsurface mineral and petroleum rights. The U.S. government, promoting the expansion of U.S. companies worldwide, was naturally concerned about that particular provision, Article 27. The adoption of the Mexican constitution was not unanimous. The U.S. government and U.S. investors hoped that the instability within Mexico and a little friendly--or not so friendly-- persuasion would restore the favorable climate for mineral and oil investment.

But it was not to be so. Venustiano Carranza had made his feelings known concerning the United States and the Monroe Doctrine. That General Pershing and U.S. troops had only recently left the country caused much resentment. The German government was trying to agitate both the U.S. and Mexican governments in order to increase the hostility between them. The officer in charge of German sabotage in the United States perceived in 1915 that Mexico was the only country the United States had to fear. "Should Mexico attack the United States, the United States would need all the arms it can produce and would not be in a position to export arms to Europe."[7] The U.S. consul in Veracruz received information "that 150 Germans (had) offered their services to Mr. Carranza to blow up trains carrying U.S. troops to the border and to blow up American warships in Mexican waters."[8] Further, in case of a U.S.-Mexican war, oil wells owned by British and Americans would be set on fire. Germans were attempting to buy or lease as much oil land as possible on behalf of their government.[9] In the opinion of the U.S. consul, the German minister and consul general in Mexico were "doing everything possible to induce Mexico to make war on the United States."[10]

As long as the Mexican question remained unresolved in the United States and the tensions between the two countries high, the Germans felt fairly safe from aggressive attack by the U.S. government. Although relations between Carranza and the German government were very bad when Carranza first gained control, as the threat of a U.S.-Mexican war increased, the relations between Carranza and the Germans became better. In the hope of receiving German assistance in case of war, Carranza tried to establish cordial relations with the German government.[11] And by the end of 1916, the Mexican envoy in Berlin had communicated to Secretary of State Zimmerman the desire for close German-Mexican cooperation.[12]

---

[6] ibid.

[7] Friedrich Katz. *The Secret War in Mexico: Europe, the United States and the Mexican Revolution.* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981), p. 330.

[8] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 55, 862.20212/38.

[9] ibid.

[10] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 55, 862.20212/27.

The tensions between the United States and Mexico were exacerbated by Carranza's plans to restore or establish normality in Mexico after the devastation of years of revolution had left the national economy a shambles. Carranza took a couple of economic measures in the form of executive decrees in an effort to get control of the country, which were inconvenient, to say the least, for investors both foreign and domestic. The first of them was in September 1916 establishing a new currency. Its effects were chiefly upon foreign banks. The German ambassador used the decree to try to get the United States to take action against Mexico. In a letter to the secretary of state, he pointed out that the U.S. government was as interested in the detrimental effects of the decree as the English, French and German governments and asked what steps the U.S. government was going to take.[13]

The request seems reasonable enough except when considering that the United States did not have formal diplomatic relations with Mexico at the time and already had troops in Mexico on a punitive expedition because of the Columbus[14] raid. The intentions of the German government became even clearer five months later with the interception of the Zimmerman note. The note was a communication between the German secretary of state and his ambassador in Mexico instructing the ambassador to seek an alliance with Mexicans soon as it might become clear that the United States would enter the war in Europe. To make the offer of alliance more attractive to Carranza, Zimmerman told his ambassador to include the Mexican recapture of Arizona, Texas and New Mexico as part of the deal.[15]

---

[11] Friedrich Katz. op. cit., p. 341.

[12] ibid., p. 348.

[13] United States Department of State. *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1917*. (New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969), p. 1002.

[14] Because of what he thought was U.S. betrayal of the peasant leaders of the Constitutionalist armies, the leader of the Northern Division, Francisco "Pancho" Villa, raided the town of Columbus, New Mexico on March 9, 1916. In response, General Pershing led a "punitive expedition," an invasion force of 6,000, deep into Mexican territory. But Villa's guerilla tactics made the invasion frustrating and futile.

James D. Cockcroft. *Mexico: Class Formation, Capital Accumulation, and the State*. (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1983), p. 110.

[15] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 55, 862.20212/69.

The German intentions were so clear that the United States government established formal diplomatic relations with the Carranza government two weeks later.

Carranza himself was sincerely neutral toward the war. His attitudes were based upon the belief that the war was purely European and based upon imperialist rivalries, and that the United States had entered the war for reasons other than those expressed by Woodrow Wilson. But the Zimmerman note had flattered Mexican national pride, and gave Carranza a weapon to hold off the extension of U.S. influence.[16] Although he publicly declared neutrality before the Mexican national congress, Carranza did not reflect attitudes held by other officials and military officers. Only two of many newspapers then circulating in Mexico City dared to print articles that displeased the pro-German radical military, and those two were forcibly closed briefly at the end of March 1917. Of those two papers, only one, *El Universal*, had not been openly pro-German.[17]

The editors of the two papers were supporters of the civilian party in opposition to the radical military party that was pro-German. The general belief was that Carranza also favored the civilians, or at least wanted their party to be strong enough to counterbalance the military group. Felix F. Palavicini, the editor of *El Universal*, always wrote flattering references to Carranza and had good political and personal relations with him. At the Querétaro constitutional convention, which resulted in the 1917 constitution, Palavicini was considered to represent the personal views of Carranza. The arrest of Palavicini and the closing of his newspaper for opposing the military party put Carranza in a difficult position. The military may have taken the action to show Carranza that they intended to control the situation.[18]

In the spring of 1918, the U.S. ambassador to Mexico, Henry P. Fletcher, found little cause for optimism concerning relations between the United States and Mexico. Restrictions imposed upon trade and the transfer of gold, border crossings by U.S. troops, inability to obtain ammunition and weapons while bandits seemed to do so easily, and the inability to get financial assistance in the United States were among the reasons for deteriorating relations. Another U.S. official felt that sympathy with Germany was characteristic of those who had gained prominence through the revolution, particularly the soldier politician classes. The great majority of Mexicans had no real complaint against the

---

[16] Arthur S. Link, ed. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson.* 56 vols. (Princeton, New Jersey: The Princeton University Press, 1966-87), v. 47, pp. 163-6.

[17] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Mexico*, M274, Reel 241, 812.911/10.

[18] ibid., 812.911/11,12.

United States "except when agitated."[19] But the Germans were also financing an anti-American newspaper campaign that was not discouraged by the government, even assisted by some officials at high levels. Because of such agitation, the ambassador was convinced that not only the government, but also the great bulk of the Mexican people would have rejoiced at a German victory in the Great War.

Until the middle of 1916, Mexican newspapers had been inclined to favor the Allies. Following the punitive expedition into Mexico led by General Pershing in response to the raid on Columbus, New Mexico, Carranza instructed the largest Mexican newspapers to take a pro-German stance in the interests of neutrality. The editor of *El Demócrata*, an independent newspaper that had previously tended to favor the Allies, was asked personally to counter the influence of other newspapers that favored the allies. The change in position resulted in the loss of lucrative French advertising, but the German government began subsidizing that and other publications supplying both money and paper. Newspapers controlled by the Mexican government made agreements for the purchase of cables from the German news service, Transozean. But until 1917, the German reports mainly consisted of information about successes against England and France in order to avoid giving the impression that Germany had any hand in creating and increasing tensions between the United States and Mexico.[20]

After the United States entered the war on the side of the Allies, however, Germany intensified its efforts to influence the Mexican press with money and anti-American propaganda. The primary tactic was to use the existing anti-American sentiments in Mexico that were based upon the history of conflict between the two nations. The friendship of Mexicans toward Germany was tenuous at best since the two nations are so distant from each other. But the United States was a traditional enemy of Mexico, and German propaganda reminded Mexicans that the United States had robbed Mexico of wealthy provinces 70 years earlier--the states mentioned in the Zimmerman note--and would not leave Mexico in peace. The Germans attempted to create a bond with Mexico by pointing out that the thousands of U.S. troops fighting them in Europe were commanded by General Pershing, who only months earlier had commanded thousands of U.S. troops against Mexicans.[21]

The financing of newspapers was something that had been discussed by Fletcher and Secretary of State Lansing. When Palavicini, the editor of *El Universal*, was released from jail and reopened his paper, he approached U.S. officials for financial assistance. Since that paper was the only pro-ally daily by that time, Ambassador Fletcher recommended that the state department arrange to advance Palavicini $5,000 to be credited through the National Type and Paper Company of New York. Since Germany was financing several newspapers, Fletcher felt that it was of great importance to U.S. interests that *El Universal* continue to be published.[22] Representatives of the National Type and Paper Company reported to Lansing that Palavicini was "shrewd and unscrupulous, and (was) probably not as hard-pressed as he pretends."[23] Nevertheless, the secretary authorized a credit of $3,000 to be made through National Type and Paper so that no official connection would appear. The credit was never made because Fletcher learned that Palavicini had not been as financially strapped as he had claimed. But it is clear that the state department was prepared to assist the newspaper in order to counteract German propaganda.

---

[19] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 55, 862.20212/68.

[20] Friedrich Katz op. cit., pp. 447-9.

[21] ibid., pp. 449-50.

The state department was also willing to take reprisals against publications and companies that engaged in pro-German or anti-American propaganda. Fletcher suggested to the secretary of state that the German firm Sommer Hermann and Company be blacklisted because it was most active in anti-American propaganda. Further, since that firm had distributed 400 rolls of newsprint gratis to pro-German and anti-American newspapers, he requested that the embassy be consulted regarding all shipments of newsprint to Mexico.[24] The ambassador reiterated the request after being informed by the local representative of National Type and Paper Company that another German was trying to buy paper.[25]

The National Type and Paper Company was the major supplier of newsprint in Mexico, selling to pro-German newspapers as well as to others, although they always voluntarily notified the U.S. embassy of shipments. The company representative in Mexico City, I. H. Jacobs, did not think that an embargo on newsprint would be effective because Mexican mills were capable of meeting all of the newsprint needs of Mexico, and an embargo would only cause ill will and the imposition of duties that would make it impossible for U.S. firms to compete with Mexican suppliers.[26] Secretary of State Lansing agreed with Jacobs. He did not believe that an embargo would be advantageous because it might be seen as an autocratic attempt to control public opinion. Instead of an embargo, Lansing suggested that U.S., French and English businesses extensively advertise in anti-American newspapers in order to gain leverage to force the publication of favorable news and editorials through the threat of withdrawal.[27]

---

[22] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Mexico*, M274, Reel 241, 812.911/17.

[23] ibid., 812.911/19.

[24] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 58, 862.20212/264.

[25] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 58, 862.20212/516.

[26] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 58, 862.20212/566.

But Ambassador Fletcher thought that German subsidies of anti-American newspapers would make the advertising scheme impracticable, and that the restriction of newsprint sales would not have a bad effect since it would only apply to those publications that were already printing anti-American propaganda for those readers who already had ill will toward the United States. The choice, as Fletcher saw it, was between aiding and abetting anti-American propaganda, while incidentally helping limited U.S. export trade, and controlling paper shipments to make slanderous and malicious attacks more difficult.[28] Lansing acquiesced, recommending that the disposition of newsprint stocks and future shipments of the National Type and Paper Company and the International Paper Company be controlled by the U.S. embassy.[29] The two companies provided Fletcher with detailed accounts of their stocks, and the Exports Embargo Board did not issue licenses for newsprint to Mexico without first advising him and gaining his approval.[30]

Publicity, Propaganda and Censorship

The Wilson administration ended up taking a very active role in propaganda outside of normal official channels through the Committee on Public Information (CPI). The committee of four was originally established as a domestic operation with the purpose of fulfilling needs perceived by the administration for confidence, enthusiasm and service in the United States in order to carry out the war effort effectively. In the opinion of the cabinet members on the committee--the secretaries of state, war and navy--the two functions of the committee were to be censorship and publicity joined in such a way as to give each citizen "the feeling of partnership that comes with full, frank statements concerning the conduct of public business."[31] The fourth member of the committee, George Creel, was Wilson's admiring friend and campaign biographer. Creel felt that the word "censorship" was offensive to Americans, to be avoided in the description of the function of CPI. Neither was the function "propaganda in the German sense, but straight news with relation to America's purposes."[32] By stressing the publicity function, the suppressive features of the work of the committee would go unregarded and unresented. The purpose of those suppressive features was to "end the whole ugly business of lying, malicious nagging."[33] With the assumption that the press was more than willing to co-operate, Creel issued guidelines for censorship--edited by Wilson-- to the Washington press corps.

---

[27] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 58, 862.20212/580a.

[28] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 58, 862.20212/581.

[29] ibid.

[30] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 58, 862.20212/615.

[31] Arthur S. Link. op. cit., v. 42, p. 55.

CPI operations were not strictly domestic; foreign offices were established with goals similar to those of the CPI in the United States. But in Mexico, the initial purpose of the information campaign was not so much to influence public sentiment as to show that the United States could be at least as enterprising as Germany.[34] The director of the Mexico office was Robert H. Murray, a staff correspondent for the New York *World* who continued his employment for that paper while working for CPI. He had lived in Mexico for seven years before CPI began to operate there--a period corresponding to the revolution--and had interviewed all presidents of the revolutionary period. Murray's assessment of the attitudes of the Mexican government was similar to that of Ambassador Fletcher. A conservative assumption about the position of the Mexican government was that it was at least passively pro-German and anti-American. But the anti-American sentiment had nothing to do with the war in Europe. Rather it was based upon historical causes of past U.S. attempts at influence, creating a latent mistrust that was dormant or active according to how it might serve politicians and opposition agitators. For the work of CPI, Mexico was considered to be a normally antagonistic territory.[35]

The CPI staff in Mexico grew to include correspondents who were American consuls and vice-consuls, allied and American businessmen, friendly Mexicans and an office staff of about two dozen. Altogether almost ninety people worked for CPI in some capacity at one time.[36] Along with operating expenses, Creel sent instructions to Murray not to subsidize newspapers either directly or indirectly, but Murray proposed that some of the less financially capable newspapers in the interior of the country be assisted in subscribing to AP, with the aid being channeled through the American Chamber of Commerce in Mexico in order to obscure U.S. government involvement. Creel modified his position, telling to Murray to use his discretion when pro-ally papers in Monterrey and Guadalajara appeared to be in financial trouble.

---

[32] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 58, 862.20212/608.

[33] Arthur S. Link. op. cit., v. 42, p. 41.

[34] James R. Mock and Cedric Larson. op. cit., pp. 324-5.

[35] ibid., pp. 323-4.

[36] ibid., pp. 326.

The mechanism for support was to be advertising placed by American firms. In attempts to get favorable treatment by newspapers, CPI also threatened newsprint embargo and cut-off of information sources. In the case of the most pro-German paper, *El Demócrata*, CPI cut off advertising revenue under their control in addition to cutting off supplies of newsprint and information. The paper not only survived, but mystified Creel with the ability of its editors to obtain information. But communication through CPI was carefully designed to avoid the appearance that the U.S. government was behind all its efforts. Messages sent by the committee to people in Mexico were printed on a special letterhead without the names of the cabinet secretaries so it would not appear that they were trying to influence public sentiment in Mexico.[37]

CPI wanted to reach more than just the relatively small literate segment of the population and naturally turned to movies as the most appropriate medium. In August of 1917, Secretary of State Lansing asked Ambassador Fletcher what he thought about a film of U.S. scenes pertaining to war preparation, school activities, lives of U.S. workmen, and the activities of various departments of government.[38] Fletcher replied that he thought it would be a good idea.[39] So it was doubtless well received when Murray reported to Fletcher the following June,

> It is quite evident that no more effective manner of impressing the American point of view upon these people and familiarizing them with American affairs and institutions can be offered than through the display of any and all sorts of American films. It is the best sort of propaganda. French and Italian films and film players have brought their countries, and their people, closer to the Mexican people in the past few years , than we and our country have ever been.[40]

Originally, the movies were to be shown in public squares, but the CPI staff was persuaded that movies would have less appearance of propaganda if they were shown in regular movie theaters. Threats of blacklisting persuaded reluctant exhibitors to show films. The blacklist, officially known as the Enemy Trading List, was a tool used by the War Trade Board in its exercise of complete control over imports and exports. The activities of the WTB were not always directly related to the war, as in the case of embargoes on food and gold meant to force a change in Carranza's petroleum tax decree and Article 27.[41] The WTB also embargoed shipments of newsprint to newspapers that were reluctant to print information provided by CPI.[42]

---

[37] ibid., pp. 328-30.

[38] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 58, 862.20212/580a.

[39] ibid., 862.20212/581.

[40] ibid., 862.20212/1337.

At the beginning of the movie campaign, Jacob Granat, owner and controller of eight movie houses in Mexico City, was refused export license by WTB even though he was not on the blacklist and should not have been on it because he was working with CPI. At the same time, German Camus, who should have been blacklisted for handling German propaganda films and advertising in El Demócrata, enjoyed "every privilege from which, for some reason, Mr. Granat seems to be barred".[43] Murray advised Fletcher that Granat should be granted an export license for the sake of the success of the program.[44] Two weeks later Allied movies were running in those theaters. By the time the armistice was signed, CPI was in virtual control of the movie business in Mexico and had made plans for its complete domination.[45]

Going outside the bounds of censorship and publicity, Murray established reading rooms and instituted classes in English, French, bookkeeping and shorthand late in 1918. His justification was that the existing literate and educated Mexicans tended to be pro-German. But through the classes, CPI could create a newly educated and literate group with pro-American inclinations. Murray thought that much of the cause for the poor relations between the United States and Mexico could be traced to ignorance and misunderstanding. The education program was intended to begin to clear away such problems. Since ignorance and misunderstanding was considered a problem on both sides of the border, George F. Weeks, the Mexican News Bureau director, published a news bulletin in English about Mexico to be distributed in the United States.[46] (The director of the CPI Foreign Press Bureau urged continuation of such efforts after the armistice in a report to Creel,[47] but Creel did not have the authority to continue the operation of CPI itself in the face of congressional mistrust,[48] and all efforts in Mexico ended when the office was closed in January of 1919. CPI ceased to exist not long afterward.)

The chief medium for propaganda, upon which all else was based, was news. Through the CPI daily cable service, Compub, over 4,400,000 words were distributed.

---

[41] Emily S. Rosenberg. op. cit., p. 69.

[42] ibid., p. 80.

[43] National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reel 58, 862.20212/1337.

[44] ibid.

[45] James R. Mock and Cedric Larson. op. cit., pp. 326-7.

[46] ibid., p. 321.

[47] ibid., p. 328.

[48] Emily S. Rosenberg. op. cit., p. 84.

Daily and weekly news bulletins were carried post free by the Mexican government, evidently in spite of their at least passive pro-German attitude.[49] But German propaganda attacked the reports issued not only by CPI, but also by the U.S. wire services. It mattered little whether information was made available to newspapers if the editors did not consider it credible enough to print. CPI wanted to convince editors of the accuracy of the reports about war preparation and popular support in the United States. With that goal in mind, and in the hopes of bringing about a more favorable climate of opinion, CPI invited about two dozen Mexican journalists and editors to tour the United States and meet with President Wilson personally. No representative of *El Demócrata*, the most staunchly pro-German newspaper, was invited on the tour.

Mexican Journalists Tour the United States

The tour took place in June and early July 1918, and included visits to shipyards, munitions factories, airplane factories, and other industrial centers. Although the visit by the journalists was not an official one, Carranza urged them to take the trip probably to further his own public relations goals at no expense to Mexico.[50] The first major city on the itinerary was New Orleans. The editor of *Revista de Revistas*, José de J. Núñez y Domínguez, wrote about the flags flown at places men had left to become soldiers, with the number of stars on the flag indicating the number of men who had gone from that place. The flags also represented the moral discipline and spiritual unity of a people. He wrote touchingly of the sacrifice they made who sent an only son whom they might never again embrace. On this first stop of the trip he was already impressed with how Americans supported the war effort. The journalists were well received and entertained in New Orleans. They continued on to Washington by way of Atlanta, passing through that city with only enough opportunity to observe that the city was quite black--because of its inhabitants.[51]

Upon their arrival in Washington, the Mexican journalists were greeted by representatives of the departments of state, war and navy--the secretaries of which departments constituted CPI along with George Creel. Núñez y Domínguez wrote favorably not only of the city with its setting and its monuments, but also of the factories and the people who worked in them.[52] But the main feature of the visit to the U.S. capitol was the meeting with President Wilson. The journalists were nervous and awed while waiting in the White House for Wilson to appear. When he did appear, the president was relaxed and sincere, dignified without being aloof. He gave the impression of confidence and democratic simplicity, as if he were an honored citizen of any city in the country, an ordinary man rather than a princely head of state.[53] Wilson gave a message to the journalists that was intended to be a major policy statement about relations between the United States and Mexico, and by extension to the rest of Latin America.

---

[49] James R. Mock and Cedric Larson. op. cit., p. 328.
[50] *Washington Post*, 6 June 1918, p. 7.
[51] *Excélsior*. México, 6 June 1918, p. 3.
[52] ibid.

The message gave a new interpretation to the Monroe Doctrine. It said that the United States had neither the intention nor the right to interfere in the affairs of Mexico, that U.S. troops had been sent only to assist Mexicans in ridding themselves of the man who was making it impossible for them to settle their internal affairs themselves. It was a disinterested action, just as the actions of the United States in Europe were disinterested. The attitude of the United States was friendship, "not merely the sort of friendship which prompts one not to do his neighbor any harm, but the sort of friendship which earnestly desires to do his neighbor service".[54] Wilson expressed regret and shame for past relations with Mexico when the United States took advantage of that country. Wilson perceived past difficulties in relations as proceeding from the adoption of the Monroe Doctrine by the United States without the consent of any of the states of South or Central America.

The old interpretation of the doctrine protected those states from aggression by nations outside the hemisphere, but not from the United States in whose interest the doctrine was enforced. The new interpretation called for a common guarantee of political independence and territorial integrity, with all the nations of the hemisphere uniting against an aggressor nation, even if that aggressor were the United States. He had already called the United States "the champions of those nations which have not had the military standing which would enable them to compete with the strongest nations in the world",[55] so Wilson was obviously aware that in the face of U.S. aggression, the nations of South and Central America would be virtually powerless. But he said that suspicion leads to misunderstanding, which causes trouble. Peace requires trust, and Wilson called it the patriotic duty of each in his own country to sow the seeds of trust and confidence rather than suspicion. The new interpretation, then, said that the United States would protect the nations of the hemisphere from each other.

The president had not wanted the message to be released in the United States, but rather to be published in Mexico and Latin America and return to the United States from sources in those countries. The decision was reversed and the the complete text was released by CPI, but Wilson did delay the release until after the message had been published in Mexico. U.S. newspapers were able to print summaries of the message, and the Associated Press picked up the text from Havana newspapers before its release in the United States. Wilson's words were of such a nature that one could hardly disagree with the policy they expressed. But that policy was at odds with other official communications to and actions toward Mexico. President Carranza could not reject the policy stated in the message to the journalists, but he could point out the difference between that publicly stated policy and the policy stated in private diplomatic communications. That difference and how it was made known will be discussed later. The visiting journalists still had many places to visit and some views of their own to express.

---

[53] *Excélsior*. México, 29 June 1918, p. 3.
[54] Arthur S. Link. op. cit., v. 48, p. 255.
[55] ibid., p. 256.

A report published in *Excélsior* about the visit to Philadelphia was more about the city than about the visit. The city is described as one of the most important industrial centers of the United States with factories that formerly produced machines for industry and agriculture, and foundries that formerly produced the enormous steel skeletons for the skyscrapers of New York and Chicago. But the city found itself entirely transformed by the war, producing systems of war machinery rather than agricultural implements. The journalists visited Independence Hall, the Hog Island shipyards and the Baldwin Locomotive Company, which employed many Mexican laborers who stopped working to shake hands and talk with the visitors.[56] It was probably such reports as this that fueled criticism in Mexico that the journalists were being used by the U.S. government, and that the intention of CPI was to use the trip to influence the journalists' sentiments. But the journalists themselves felt that it was they who were influencing sentiment toward Mexico.

During their stay in the New York area, the journalists toured the Merrit military instruction camp and the airfield at Mineola, and went to a baseball game. Programs including lunches were prepared by the Pan-American Society and the National Paper and Type Company,[57] the same company that was to have been the chosen instrument of the state department in the financial assistance of *El Universal*. The visitors had the opportunity to make a few remarks of their own at the lunches. Carlos Gonzales Pena, editor of *El Universal Ilustrado*, said that German propaganda in Mexico was not as extensive as it had been made out to be in the United States.[58] José E. Campos of Excelsior explained the basis for the sympathies of the Mexicans. "The Mexican, like other Latin Americans, primarily in the war is pro-French and pro-Italian, in sympathy with the Latin races in the war. He is so because his culture in Latin. All the propaganda in the world cannot change that".[59]

---

[56] *Excélsior*. México, 12 June 1918, p. 1, 4.
[57] ibid., p. 2.
[58] *New York Times*, 12 June 1918, p. 11.

The Mexican journalists continued to tour industrial sites engaged in war preparation and military training facilities in the East and Upper Midwest. And on the two-day trip from Minneapolis to Seattle, they were able to see expansive wheat fields, herds of cattle and sheep, enormous forests, vegetable farms and other agricultural operations. Once in Seattle, however, they were again touring shipyards, factories and military schools.[60] Núñez y Domínguez, poet that he was, continued to relate his observations in moving human terms, writing about the scene around him at a busy train station where troops were being shipped out, a conductor on the platform comforting the sweetheart of a young soldier as his train departed. It was "the immortal vignette that war brings to all cities."[61] The visitors were well entertained until they left the United States in mid July, six weeks after they had entered.

The purpose of inviting the Mexican journalists--and later, journalists from other countries--to tour the United States was to affect public sentiment in their native country by influencing the attitudes the opinion leaders. If the editors and journalists attitudes could be made to be favorable to the interests of the United States, they in turn would affect changes in public sentiment favorable to the United States through the influence of their writing and publishing. The sites chosen for the tour were selected to show how well the country was prepared to wage war. But the administration hoped to make the most political hay out of the message delivered to the journalists by President Wilson.

Reaction to Wilson's Message

Wilson's message was a new interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. But to evoke the doctrine at all was a cause for irritation and annoyance for some people, and one of those people was Venustiano Carranza, the Mexican political chief (First Chief as he was called in diplomatic correspondence, "Primer Magistrado" in Mexico) had formulated his own doctrine that repudiated the Monroe Doctrine, and said that Mexico would deal with European powers directly, and on its own terms without the aid or intercession of the United States. Since the sovereign nations of Latin America had never been consulted on whether they wanted any protection from the United States under the Monroe Doctrine, the unilateral statement of that doctrine amounted to nothing less than de facto imperialism on the part of the United States.

---

[59] ibid., p. 10.
[60] *Excélsior*. México, 2 July 1918, p. 2.
[61] *Excélsior*. México, 23 June 1918, p. 3.

But the Carranza Doctrine did not represent the views of all Latin American nations or even of all Mexicans, and many received favorably Wilson's message. Wilson had received the journalists on Saturday, June 8. The following Monday the complete text of the message was published in Mexican newspapers. On Tuesday parts of the message had been relayed back to the United States from Latin America, and on Wednesday the text was released in the United States and the rest of the world. Reaction to the speech in the New York World--the paper for which the director of the Mexican office of CPI was a correspondent--appeared in the Mexican press on Wednesday, as did reaction to the speech in the London Times. The London report was provided by "Servicios Exclusivos,"[62] which probably meant that it was provided by CPI. As could be expected, the opinions of the New York and London paper were favorable and effusive. The World said that Wilson was the most powerful and perhaps the only friend of Mexico.[63] The Times contrasted Wilson's words of liberty, justice and law with the plans of the German vice-chancellor to impose German mandates on a subjugated Europe through the military might of Germany and Austria.[64] A New York Times editorial referred to a specific part of the message saying that since the Mexican journalists could clearly see that General Pershing's current actions were idealistic and righteous, it was obvious that his past action--the incursion into Chihuahua--had been idealistic and righteous, as Wilson had said.[65]

Excelsior interviewed several members of the Chamber of Deputies for their reactions to Wilson's message, and published eight unreservedly positive opinions on Tuesday, June 11. Typically, the politicians judged Wilson's words to be a sincere twentieth-century interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, and thought that Mexico should take advantage of the opportunity to orient its foreign policy accordingly.[66] The editorial position of the newspaper itself recognized that the United States government had always shown a certain amount of surprise and annoyance that the Latin American attitude toward the Monroe Doctrine had been of suspicion, disconfidence, fear and humiliation--a clear reference to the Carranza Doctrine. *Excelsior* likened the world situation to a forest fire that perhaps nobody could extinguish, yet civilized humanity wanted to limit the conflagration and impede further ruination. The editorial opinion of the newspaper was that the sentiments Wilson expressed could be the basis for a cordiality and sincerity of relations that were very much to be desired in that calamitous period of world history.[67]

---

[62] *Excélsior*. México, 12 June 1918, p. 2.
[63] *Excélsior*. México, 12 June 1918, p. 1, 2.
[64] ibid., p. 2.
[65] *New York Times*, 12 June 1918, p. 12.
[66] *Excélsior*. México, 11 June 1918, p. 1.

Carranza's reaction to Wilson's message was reserved. Although he said it was a good message, he wanted to wait and see if the principles in it were backed up by future actions.[68] Carranza was well aware that the principles expressed in Wilson's message were hardly arguable if they expressed the true policy of the U.S. government. But whereas the message to the visiting Mexican journalists had been given out for publication so that all might have the opportunity to know the sentiments expressed in it, official diplomatic communications between the governments of the United States and Mexico expressing quite different sentiments had not been published. Carranza decided that Mexican newspaper readers should know both the public and private positions of the U.S. government. The private position expressed by the U.S. government revolved around the second decree issued by Carranza, referred to before, and Article 27 of the new Mexican constitution.

Official U.S. Threat

Article 27 provided for the nationalization of subsurface mineral rights. The decree issued by Carranza provided for taxation of petroleum. The specific provisions of the decree seemed to be confiscatory and were taken by foreign investors and governments to be implementation of Article 27. After the favorable treatment foreign oilmen had enjoyed in prerevolutionary Mexico, it was hard for them to accept heavy taxation and the knowledge that ultimately their rights would be taken from them altogether. The U.S. government was surprised and annoyed that the Mexican government would want to impose conditions that were hostile to the economic development of the resources of the country. There was no question about whether such development or foreign ownership of mineral rights was appropriate. The constitution and the decree were viewed as threats to the interests of businesses that the U.S. government wanted to support.

Carranza had issued the petroleum taxation decree on February 19, 1917. Within a month, the U.S. secretary of state was instructing his ambassador in Mexico to object strongly not only to the decree, but to the constitution as well, calling it unconstitutional--contrary to international law and precedent. The government of the United States took upon itself the function of protector of private property outside of its borders, and called the attention of the Mexican government "to the necessity which may arise to impel it to protect the property of its citizens in Mexico".[69] This warning was to be presented as the formal protest of the government of the United States.

---

[67] *Excélsior.* México, 15 June 1918, p. 3.

[68] United States Department of State. *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918.* (New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969), p. 580.

The ambassador's reply shows that the state department viewed the oil tax decree as implementation of Article 27, and the lengths to which the U.S. government was willing to go to protect the property of its citizens. According to the ambassador, the decree was merely a way of implementing a constitutional article so unpopular in Mexico that it would stand little chance of legislative enactment. Since other governments would be similarly affected by legislative enactment, the United States could seek international arbitration in such a case. In the absence of legislative action, "if the present Government should seek to give effect to this article without awaiting action by Congress--as it is claimed it has done in the recent petroleum, but which I think open to question--our Government might find itself compelled to act more quickly".[70]

On April 2, the U.S. ambassador met with the Mexican minister of foreign affairs and delivered the formal protest against the oil lands tax, as he had been instructed to do by the secretary of state. The protest included the verbatim transcription of the secretary's strongest language. The secretary of state had received information from the ambassador concerning Article 27, and instructed him to to strengthen the protest. Because of the delay in more lengthy communications carried over land or sea, the instructions arrived after the protest had already been delivered. The newer words are clear concerning the official U.S. attitude, stating that

> the Government of the United States, on behalf of its citizens who have invested vast sums of money in Mexican petroleum lands, relying, as they had a right to do, upon the laws of Mexico giving owners of the surface ownership of the subsurface deposits, enters a solemn and emphatic protest against the petroleum decree as an act of confiscation and despoliation, and reserves all rights in the premises.[71]

The U.S. government was not alone in protesting the decree. The British government also sent a formal protest holding the Mexican government "responsible for all loss and damage that may accrue to British subjects and interests in consequence of the decree."[72] Although it was a milder protest, the British protest is mentioned because the

---

[69] ibid., p. 707.
[70] ibid., p. 708.
[71] ibid., p. 715-6.
[72] ibid., p. 754.

Mexican government responded to it before they responded to the U.S. protest, and referred to it as being the same that the United States would receive.

Following a meeting with Carranza six weeks after the protest had been delivered, Ambassador Fletcher was sure that it would have the desired effect. He telegraphed to Secretary of State Lansing that the First Chief had asked a commission of cabinet-level officials to review certain features of the petroleum law.[73] Lansing responded that he was pleased that the protest had a deterrent effect, but further suggested that Fletcher "impress upon President Carranza the necessity and advisability of radically modifying (the) decree."[74] The secretary of state continued to make plans to carry out the the threats mentioned in the protest. On June 4, the day the visiting Mexican journalists arrived in New Orleans at the beginning of their tour, Lansing wrote President Wilson that it would be advisable to station 6,000 marines at Galveston so that the United States would be adequately prepared to seize the oil fields at Tampico.[75] Two days before he gave his glowing message to the visiting journalists, Wilson replied that he would "be glad to approve of the concentration and of preparation for their use if necessary," but added that he would "need to be convinced by very pressing and unusual circumstances before (assenting) to disturbing the peace of Latin America."[76]

Carranza did not know of the private communications between Lansing, Fletcher and Wilson, but he correctly interpreted the formal protest as threatening military action if he and his government did not adopt policies favorable to the commercial interests of the United States. It was the clear threat contained in the protest that kept him from embracing the principles contained in Wilson's message to the journalists. He did not like the fact that Wilson's message of brotherhood and hemispheric cooperation was widely published, while the threat of military action was kept secret. Since newspaper readers in Mexico had been given the opportunity to read the message of peace, Carranza decided that they should also be given the opportunity to read the threat of war and ordered that all Mexican newspapers carry it on June 13 with display headlines.[77]

---

[73] ibid., p. 719-20.

[74] ibid., p. 721.

[75] Arthur S. Link. op. cit., v. 48, p. 238.

[76] ibid., p. 248.

[77] United States Department of State. *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918.* (New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969), p. 732.

Reaction to Protest

The newspaper considered to be the official mouthpiece of the Mexican government, *El Pueblo*, ran the protest under the headline "President Wilson Threatens Mexico," and the pro-German *El Demócrata* said in red letters "The Government of the United States Threatens to Intervene if its Pretensions Are Not Satisfied,"[78] and that the Mexican government would reply to the protest with an energetic rebuff.[79] It used the terminology of Wilson's message mockingly in commending the annulment of the Monroe Doctrine by the Carranza Doctrine.[80] The characterization of the protest by *El Universal* was that "you must make your political code conform to the ambitious caprice of American investments in your country or you will have to reckon with me".[81] In *Excelsior*, the part of the protest containing the threatening language was printed in all capital letters.[82]

Ambassador Fletcher correctly assessed the publication order as an attempt to discredit Wilson's message and to limit the flexibility of the U.S. government in dealing with the petroleum decree. Lansing suggested that German sympathizers within the Mexican government might have been behind the release of the protest, but Fletcher replied that it had been the decision of Carranza, who was the real government of Mexico. As mentioned before, the ambassador had enjoyed cordial relations with the First Chief, and the publication of the protest seems to have angered him genuinely. His evaluation of Carranza's motivation is a succinct statement of the differences between the governments of the two countries.

> The outstanding fact is that the Mexican Government did not receive cordially the message contained in the President's recent speech to the Mexican journalists, and immediately set about to destroy its effect by the publication of my note of April 2 which this Government considers unjust, threatening and injurious to its pride and prestige, and as interfering with the free enforcement of its fundamental law and the exercise of its sovereign rights, and in this uproar the question of simple justice and national good faith is entirely overlooked.[83]

A state department reply to the publication of the protest gives further evidence of the differences between the two countries. The delivery of a major policy message by the president of the United States to visiting journalists and its immediate release for publication in the Mexican press without the prior knowledge of the Mexican government was quite proper, but the publication of the protest without the prior consent of the U.S. government was not. Lansing released a statement to the U.S. press about the publication of the protest in Mexico saying that the Mexican government properly ought to have asked U.S. consent to publish the message, even though consent would certainly have been given readily had the Mexican government only intimated that it believed the note should be published.[84] The statement, carried by AP and also published in Mexico, gave the reason for the protest as the desire that Mexico impart justice to U.S. citizens in Mexico and treat them with impartiality, and expressed the hope that U.S. citizens in Mexico would be treated the same as Mexican citizens in the United States.[85] But the petroleum decree did treat U.S. citizens impartially because it applied to both Mexicans and foreigners equally. Therefore, the thrust of the statement was the second part, meaning the desire that the laws affecting Mexicans in the United States ought to apply to Americans in Mexico.

---

[78] ibid.

[79] ibid., p. 736.

[80] ibid., p. 583.

[81] ibid., p. 736.

[82] *Excélsior*. México, 13 June 1918, p. 4.

[83] United States Department of State. *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918*. (New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969), p. 588.

Effects of U.S. Communication Efforts

The activity of the Committee on Public Information in Mexico was intended to influence public opinion. But it seems foolish even to have undertaken that activity had it not been accompanied by the hope that the sentiments and attitudes of the government would also be affected somehow. The tour of the United States must have been an important part of the plan to influence Mexican attitudes or else the president of the United States would not have met personally with the visiting journalists and delivered to them a major policy statement on international relations. In the view of Manuel Carpio, the spokesman for the Mexican journalists, however, it was they who had scored the public relations coup, not the United States. Carpio perceived that Mexico had never been held in higher esteem than they experienced in the United States. Previously, Mexico had been viewed with indifference or ill feeling as a German sympathizer, but the attitude had changed. Rather than a conquest of Mexican opinion for the United States, the tour was a conquest of U.S. opinion for Mexico, showing, among other things, that Mexican neutrality was sincere and honorable. It was the visiting journalists who brought Mexico to the attention of businessmen, bankers and industrialists, with the result that North Americans spoke with respect the names of Mexico and Venustiano Carranza.[86]

---

[84] ibid., p. 593.

[85] *Excélsior*. México, 30 June 1918, p. 1.

[86] *Excélsior*. México,18 July 1918, p.1, 4.

Publication in Mexico of the formal protest also put the government of the United States in the position of having to back up Wilson's message with something tangible. The secretary of state realized that any good effects of the message would disappear if they were not soon reinforced by some concrete action. Lansing telegraphed to Fletcher that "consideration of convenience must be swept aside and a generous liberal attitude must be adopted by the United States toward the Mexican people so that it cannot be said that our assurances of friendship are mere idle words which when put to the test fall to nothing."[87] It seemed that Carranza had scored a victory in the war of words between the two countries through the publication of the protest. The state department seemed ready to listen to him and deal with him.

In a meeting with Ambassador Fletcher at the beginning of July, Carranza explained again that the biggest problems between the two countries concerned trade restrictions imposed by the War Trade Board. Mexican exports to the United States, their only market, were not receiving their fair exchange in gold and food that was to be used for the benefit of Mexico, not for aid to enemies of the United States. Carranza wanted trade to be as free and open as possible, as Wilson had recommended in his message. In reply, Fletcher talked about the better relations described in the message and the liberal attitude described in Lansing's telegram. Also, the two talked about the protest, the tax decree and the Mexican constitution. Carranza was ready to believe that Wilson had not known of the protest when it was sent. The U. S. ambassador ant the Mexican political chief had a very good working relationship. Carranza had confidence in Fletcher, and the ambassador's message during this conference was especially well received.[88]

The cordial attitude of the Mexican president was reflected in a message sent to Wilson on July 4, the anniversary of U.S. independence, wishing prosperity and peace for the United States.[89] Wilson's reply was only slightly less amicable in tone, stressing mutual assistance and common interest.[90] But the relations between the countries turned out not to be cordial. The United States had gained no political ground through the publication of Wilson's message or token concessions, and the publication of the protest in Mexico failed to force the United States to back away from its threat. By the middle of July, the two governments were again bickering over the petroleum tax decree and Article 27. Fletcher wrote to Lansing that the Mexican government was determined to carry them out, and that they were such a serious impediment to good international relations that attempts at cordial friendship would be futile.[91]

---

[87] United States Department of State. *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918*. (New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969), p. 587.

[88] ibid., p. 594-7.

[89] *Excélsior*. México, 5 July 1918, p.1.

[90] *Excélsior*. México,11 July 1918, p.1

Less than four weeks later, Lansing directed Fletcher to seek an extension on enforcement of the petroleum tax decree, and reiterated the protest since a formal reply had not been received.[92] The extension was denied. With obvious displeasure at the U.S. threat, Carranza reiterated to Fletcher his reply to the British government in which he said

> the Mexican Government cannot do otherwise than express the surprise which the note and protest of His Majesty's Government has occasioned it, for the reason that in issuing the said decree it did so in the legitimate exercise of its sovereignty as the Government of an independent nation, and the only remedy is the recourse provided by Mexican laws in cases where taxes decreed by the public power are considered to be burdensome or confiscatory.
>
> The surprise of the Mexican Government is legitimate, as would be that of the Government of any other independent nation--including that of His Britanic Majesty--should it find that its acts with respect to its interior affairs, such as the right to impose taxation, were the subject of diplomatic protests by powers whose subjects were affected by such taxation. So much so is this the case that it is certain His Britanic Majesty's Government would not permit to be made any diplomatic reclamations against the necessarily high taxation which the war has forced it to decree throughout its dominions and which weigh equally not only upon English citizens and the subjects of the countries conquered or under its dominion in any form, but upon all foreigners as well.[93]

The First Chief refused to allow the interference of foreign governments into the internal politics of Mexico. He expressed preference for the exhaust of all peaceful means to settle the matter, but if war or intervention turned out to be unavoidable, he was prepared to confront that regrettable alternative.

Carranza was still holding the trump card. The United States government did not want war on another front, but rather continued rights to subsurface minerals and oil. He seems to have interpreted the message of Woodrow Wilson to mean that the U.S. president did not want war with Mexico and had no intention of getting involved in one. The hands of the U.S. government were tied by the publication of the message given to the Mexican journalists. Wilson spoke of brotherhood and hemispheric cooperation and interdependence, but especially of good relations with Mexico. The message had been published worldwide. Carranza had not forgotten Wilson's assurances to the people of the United States that he would keep them out of the European war, and upon that basis had questioned the sincerity of the message to the journalists. Furthermore, the Mexicans still had the Zimmerman note. War with Mexico would have ensured that the property rights of U.S. citizens in Mexico would be in jeopardy. Negotiation and diplomacy might ultimately fail, but they would at least give U.S. interests time to find ways around the Mexican laws and decrees.

---

[91] United States Department of State. *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918*. (New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969), p. 736-7.

[92] ibid., p. 754-5.

[93] ibid., p. 756.

Implementation of certain features of the petroleum tax decree was postponed and U.S. interests did have time to continue operation. But the conflict over Article 27 continued for two decades until mineral and oil rights were nationalized by President Lázaro Cárdenas. The threats delivered by the U.S. state department may have delayed the final outcome, or may have insured it. But it seems certain that the threats damaged the credibility of the United States and Woodrow Wilson, while strengthening Mexican resolve to resist U.S. influence. The work of the Committee on Public Information in Mexico was offset by the heavy handed style of the state department. And when the war in Europe came to an end, the U.S. government was quick to dissolve CPI, sending what must have been a clear signal that the United States government is interested in friendship only when it is convenient or in the immediate interest of the United States. In other words, the old interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine was still in force.

The effects of the official diplomatic communications from the U.S. government to the Mexican government are clear. They angered the Mexicans and ultimately failed to achieve the goals they sought. The effects of the communications and activities of CPI in Mexico are difficult to determine specifically, but their tendency seems clear. Robert Murray, the director of the Mexican office, tells how reaction to U.S. movies gradually changed from angry demonstrations, hoots and yells, to cheering, applause and shouts of "viva" for the U.S. flag, president, war vessels and soldiers.[94] However, one could expect him to give a favorable description of the results of work for which he was responsible. The reaction of the Mexican journalists is a less partial indicator of what the efforts of CPI could accomplish.

The journalists felt they had been given a great opportunity to bring Mexico to the attention of the people of the United States, while CPI felt the visitors were learning about the United States. Both are true. And the later programs of the Mexican office of CPI indicate that it was the intention of the staff that both should be true. News bulletins were published about the United States for distribution in Mexico, and about Mexico for distribution in the United States. The reading rooms and classes set up by CPI gave the Mexican people something useful, not just propaganda. In other words, CPI was achieving its goals in such a way as to give Mexicans the impression that they were achieving their own goals.

---

[94] James R. Mock and Cedric Larson. op. cit., pp. 326-7.

The implication is that foreign relations can be better improved or maintained through channels other than those of formal diplomatic communication. The CPI staff, as mentioned, wanted to continue the work they had started and which they felt needed to be done. Congress disagreed and ended all of the work. It was not until the next world war was imminent that similar activities were begun once again. But key attributes of the CPI effort in Mexico were that information was flowing in both directions using the tools of mass communication, and that the senders were also receivers. Both of those attributes are of interest in discussion present global mass communication.

Sources Consulted

Bravo Ugarte, José. *Periodistas y periodicos mexicanos (hasta 1935. selección).* México: Editorial Jus, S. A., 1966.

Cockcroft, James D. *Mexico: Class Formation, Capital Accumulation, and the State.* New York: Monthly Review Press, 1983.

Committee on Public Information. *Official Bulletin.* Washington, D. C. various dates, 1917- 1918.

Creel, George. *Complete Report of the Chairman of the Committee on Public Information.* New York: Da Capo Press, 1972.

________. *Rebel at Large: Recollections of Fifty Crowded Years.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1947.

________. *The people Next Door: An Interpretive History of Mexico and the Mexicans.* New York: The John Day Company, 1926.

El Demócrata. México. various dates, 1917-1918.

Excélsior. México. various dates, 1917-1918.

Gilderhaus, Mark T. *Diplomacy and Revolution: U.S.-Mexican Relations under Wilson and Carranza.* Tucson, Arizona: the University of Arizona Press, 1977.

Katz, Friedrich. *The Secret War in Mexico: Europe, the United States and the Mexican Revolution.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Lascurian y Osio, Angel. *La segunda intervención americana.* México: Editorial Jus, S. A., 1957.

Link, Arthur S., ed. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson.* 56 vols. Princeton, New Jersey: The Princeton University Press, 1966-87.

Mock, James R. and Larson, Cedric. *Words that Won the War: The Story of the Committee on Public Information 1917-1919.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939.

National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Germany*, M336, Reels 55, 56, 58 and 59.

National Archives. *Records Relating to the Internal Affairs of Mexico*, M274, Reel 241.

New Orleans Times Picayune, 4 June 1918.

New York Times, 11 June 1918 to 17 June 1918.

Ochoa Campos, Moises. *Reseña histórica del periodismo mexicano.* México: Editorial Porrua, S. A., 1968.

Rosenberg, Emily S. *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1982.

United States Department of State. *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918*. New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969.

United States Department of State. *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1917*. New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969.

United States Department of State. *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1917--Supplement*. New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969.

Vaughn, Stephen. *Holding Fast the Inner Lines: Democracy, Nationalism and the Committee on Public Information*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

Washington Post, 6 June 1918, 8 June 1918, 12 June 1918.

Winkler, Allan M. *The Politics of Propaganda*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

Buried in Mud:
The Coffin Handbill and the Presidential Election of 1828

by Marc Charisse
University of Washington

One of the most striking images of the 1988 presidential campaign appeared in television spots critical of Democratic contender Michael Dukakis: sinister-looking men in prison garb wound endlessly through a revolving door. The charge that the Democrat was soft on crime was central to the campaign. In nearly every speech, Republican candidate George Bush made reference to furloughed rapist Willie Horton. Illinois Republicans distributed a leaflet charging that "ALL THE MURDERERS AND RAPISTS AND DRUG PUSHERS AND CHILD MOLESTERS IN MASSACHUSETTS VOTE FOR MICHAEL DUKAKIS."[1]

At least the G.O.P. had the decency to leave the candidate's mother out of it. Smear tactics 150 years before were not so gracious. "General Jackson's mother was a COMMON PROSTITUTE," charged an 1828 newspaper, "brought to this country by the British soldiers! She afterwards married a MULATTO MAN, with whom she had several children, of which number General JACKSON IS ONE!!!"[2] Apparently, the 64 percent of the respondents to a Newsweek poll who considered the campaign more negative than those of previous years knew little of Andrew Jackson's race against John Quincy Adams. If Dukakis's opponents charged that Massachusetts murderers favored the Democrat, the accusation still stopped short of that of the general's opponents that Jackson himself was a killer.

It is that very charge -- that Gen. Jackson was a man who enjoyed the slaughter of his fellows beyond military necessity -- that created what was arguably the greatest stir of the 1828 presidential campaign. The charge was leveled in the "Coffin Handbill," a piece of campaign propaganda that was widely reprinted in subsequent circulars and newspapers before the election. Evaluation of the handbill's effectiveness by modern scholars has ranged from "enormously effective"[3] to "[t]hey probably lost as many votes as they gained."[4] These views reflect the contradictions which permeate our understanding of both 19th and 20th century politics and political discourse -- particularly the difference negative political communication makes in a campaign. Political consultant George Christian has noted that "The man on the street always says he doesn't like dirty politics. Then he goes home and watches it with relish on television."[5]

An examination of the role played by the Coffin Handbill in the 1828 election suggests both positions have merit. Personal attacks have a long history in our politics, and while they may be disliked in principle, they are may be very effective in stimulating interest in the electoral process. At the same time, the handbill's history reflects a political culture very different from our own.

Kathleen Jamieson has observed that, "Those who pine for presidential campaigns as they were in Jefferson, Jackson, or Lincoln's times and who see our nation's political decline and fall mirrored in the rise of political spot advertising remember a halcyon past that never was."[6] It is tempting believe that the discourse of modern politics is really not that much different from that practiced since the time of the early days of the Republic. But before one can generalize across cultures in this way one must make an effort to understand political communication in the context of the era which produced it. Surface similarities may be only customs born of repetition, alike in origin but different in historical meaning.

The Handbill

Parton begins his description of the 1828 campaign with "a stunning flourish of trumpets"[7] on the eighth of January, 1828, the thirteenth anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans. The Louisiana legislature had invited Jackson to the celebration, and the general's triumphal procession down the Mississippi bore an unmistakably military stamp. A flotilla of steamboats bearing the conqueror and battalions of his veterans wound slowly down the mighty river, greeted by the loud huzzahs of enthusiastic spectators on the banks. As the ships entered New Orleans harbor, an eyewitness remembers that the "fleet kept up a constant fire of artillery, which was answered from several ships in the harbor and from the shore."[8] Jackson stood on the deck of the Pocohantas, his head uncovered, the very image of the citizen-soldier.

Old Hickory himself recognized the symbolic impact of the visit: "The splendor of the scene of the Steam Boats, the waving of the various flags from the shipping, and else where, the cheering of the citizens on the places where we met the enemy and saved the City, were all well calculated to inspire feelings inexpressible".[9] The return of the general to the site of his greatest victory was also important politically. Jackson's enemies in Congress were resurrecting the issue of six militiamen under Jackson's command who had been executed following the Creek campaign the year before New Orleans. Kentucky congressmen Richard Buckner and Francis Johnson were charging that Jackson had executed the militiamen unjustly. The tale told by the anti-Jackson forces was that the militiamen had served their compulsory term of three months and were headed home, possibly with permission from their direct superiors, when they were arrested, tried, and shot on Jackson's order.

Jackson presented his side of the story in a January 1828 letter to James Allen. In September 1814, a group of drafted militia seized the garrison at Fort Jackson, Alabama, in the middle of hostile Indian territory. Jackson, who was at New Orleans, ordered the men's commanding officer, Col. Pipkin, to take the remainder of his regiment, rendezvous with Gen. John Coffee's Tennessee volunteers, and apprehend the mutineers. The deserters, according to Jackson, became alarmed, and all but nine ringleaders surrendered and were pardoned. The remaining nine were apprehended and tried at Mobile; three were pardoned at the recommendation of the court, the other six were shot. Jackson defended the executions, which, he wrote, came "at a time when every patriot's arm was stretched, when every nerve of the Govt. was strained to defend our liberties and our country from conquest and subjugation."[10] But in any case, Jackson added, the executions were the recommendation of the court martial, not his own. "Thus you see, Sir, with the exception of my being commander of the division, Mr. Buckner had as much to do with the execution of these men as I had."[11]

John Binns, Irish emigre and editor of the Philadelphia Democratic Press, understood that this was a story different from others circulated about the general. Stories about Jackson's mother, or about the circumstances surrounding his marriage, reflected on his "moral, or rather his domestic . . . character."[12] But the tale of the militiamen went to the heart of Jackson's political strength, his popularity as a soldier. As Tocqueville was to observe shortly after Jackson's second election:

> General Jackson . . . is a man of violent character and middling capacities; nothing in the whole of his career indicated him to have the qualities needed for governing a free people . . . It is all due to the memory of a victory he won twenty years ago under the walls of New Orleans.[13]

Other anti-Jackson stories detailing his military shortcomings circulated, including the charge that Jackson had left Louisiana before New Orleans and returned only after he was ordered to do so. But here was a tale which could be told with considerable dramatic impact, and one which, Binns believed, was "mainly supported by official documents."[14] Therefore, the editor thought he had campaign ammunition which could destroy the Hero's military reputation, and he created the handbill as the vehicle for his attack. As Binns later recalled:

> In order to arrest public attention and impress the public mind with the injustice and the enormity of the crime of General Jackson, in respect to the shooting of these militia men, I had six coffins cast in type metal, and on each of them the name of one of the men who had been shot. I had supplements to the "Democratic Press" printed, with the coffins printed on them, together with the history of the whole transaction, and had one of those supplements sent with every copy of the daily, tri-weekly, and weekly "Democratic Press." Thus several thousand coffin handbills were circulated through the United States.[15]

The circulation of the handbills went well beyond the several thousand Binns said he printed. The handbills were also produced separately as broadsides, and sold to the public for 50 cents per hundred; one issue of the Democratic Press announced a printing of 10,000 handbills.[16] In addition, newspapers on both sides discussed the matter of the militiamen. Anti-Jackson editors issued reprints to which they appended other stories of Old Hickory's supposed blood lust. Binns himself issued an eight-page pamphlet version which included more detail on each of the six slain soldiers, entitled Monumental Inscriptions, in the waning weeks of the campaign.

The original Coffin Handbill was headlined "SOME ACCOUNT OF SOME OF THE BLOODY DEEDS OF GENERAL JACKSON A brief account of the Execution of the Six Militia Men". The handbill advised that "As we may soon expect to have the official documents in relation to the SIX MILITIA MEN, arrested, tried, and put to death, under the orders of General Andrew Jackson, this may not be an improper time to give to the public some of the particulars of their execution, as we have them from "AN EYE WITNESS".[17] The eyewitness, never named, goes on to describe the killings. The six condemned men were taken by wagon to the execution site, where they were made to kneel on their own coffins as white caps were drawn down over their faces. Only one, a John Harris, who is described as a Baptist preacher, "betrayed a feminine weakness." Binns excused the man's tears as the result of thoughts of the wife and nine children he would leave behind. Another, Henry Lewis, dies in a more manly fashion, declaring "I am now as firm as I have been in battle, and you shall see that I will die as becomes a soldier." After the squad of 36 men has delivered its fire, Binns' unnamed "eyewitness" relates that the fatally wounded Lewis struggled to pull himself up on top of the nearest coffin and asked the officer in charge of the execution if he had behaved well. "Yes," replied Col. Russell. "Like a man." The colonel orders that Lewis should be spared, but the soldier dies four days later in "inconceivable agony."

After the eyewitness' tale, Binns observes:

> The order bears date the very day after General Jackson returned in triumph to New Orleans, and the day before he joyfully went, under triumphal arches, to the Temple of the living God; where, says the historian, 'they crowned their adored general with laurels'. The order for the execution of these six unhappy men bears date January 22, 1815. His crown of laurels had not yet withered, when blood, the life's blood of his countrymen, of his fellow soldiers, flowed plentifully by his order.

This evocation of war's darker side continues in one of the stanzas in an original poem in which Binns commemorates Jackson's cruelty: "Methinks I hear the muffled drum,/And see the column move;/--Lo here they come -- how sad their looks:/Farewell to life and love!"

The handbill also described others slain by Jackson, further advancing the argument that the general must really have enjoyed killing people. In addition to the militiamen were seven regulars, shot by order of the general near Nashville. The rationale behind these deaths is unexplained, although desertion is suggested. Presumably such a man of "Blood and carnage" as General Jackson needed no reasons to execute his own troops.

There was also the case of John Woods, a soldier shot on the personal order of Jackson, the handbill claimed, for no other reason than a minor altercation with "an upstart little officer, who was not Woods' equal at home." Also detailed was a fight between Jackson and some of his associates, including Coffee, and brothers Jesse and Thomas Hart Benton. This public battle fought with daggers and pistols became an issue in the 1824 campaign with the publication of a pamphlet by Jesse Benton. The description included on the Coffin Handbill is printed in the form of a letter dated "Sept. 10, 1818, Franklin, Tenn.," and signed "Thomas Hart Benton, Lieut. Col. 39th Infantry And now a member of the Senate of the United States." By 1828, Benton was an ardent supporter of Old Hickory, but the fight, in which Jackson was shot in the shoulder and severely wounded, was a matter of record.

There is also a description of a fight between Jackson and one Samuel Jackson, who the general killed on the street in Nashville. A grand jury indicted Jackson, but the hero was subsequently acquitted. "Gentle reader," advises the handbill, "it is for you to say, whether this man, who carries a sword cane, and is willing to run it through the body of any one who may presume to stand in his way, is a fit person to be our President."

Finally, the handbill even attempted to arouse sympathy for Jackson's Indian foes, by appealing to the reader's sense of fair play. The handbill described two encounters with Indians, each purportedly drawn from Jackson's own accounts of the battles. Both mention the slaughter of women and children. In one, Binns noted that several prisoners were "decoyed" aboard Jackson's boats, adding, "If the Indians, according to the customs of their nation, put to death a prisoner, all the feelings of our nature rise into indignation against them. With what feelings then should we contemplate the decoying and cold-blooded murder of prisoners by a civilized man in the face of the laws and customs of his country!"

Concluded Binns: "Reader, mark the perfect indifference with which Gen Jackson shoots, hangs or stabs his fellow beings, with or without trial, and the more than callous, aye, even exulting composure, with which he details his horrid and bloody deeds!"

The Assessment

Binns' strategy seems clear. The juxtaposition of the executions and the crowning of the Hero reflected not only the battle itself, but the return of Jackson to New Orleans at the beginning of the campaign. The descriptions of the slain militiamen were designed to arouse sympathy, and in the case of Harris, support from Baptists, a significant political force in Jackson's strongest areas, the South and West. America was a nation of individualists, and Woods and the six militiamen were portrayed as fellow citizens asserting their rights. A populist candidate ought support such individuality rather than order its destruction.

There is much in the handbill, however, which invited alternative interpretation. Harris can be viewed as a coward, further evidence that he and the others got only what they deserved. The depiction of Indian battles might have done more to recall the horrors of these conflicts, and the very real role Jackson played in making the frontier safer, than to arouse sympathy for the Indian, particularly in the western and southern states.

Remini has argued that the Benton incident helped the Adams forces, in that it depicted the Hero of New Orleans as "a common Barroom brawler."[18] But the incident, to those familiar with it, can also be viewed as contributing in another way to the Hickory legend: Jackson, severely wounded in the fray, had soaked through two mattresses with his blood before the surgeons stanched the flow. Nonetheless, the determined Hero ordered, "I'll keep my arm."[19] And did, together with the bullet, for more than 20 years. A barroom brawler, perhaps. But also a hickory-tough man of action with whom the common people might more certainly identify than his scholarly patrician opponent in the White House.

The handbill's very appearance is also significant. It was the coffins themselves that excited the public's imagination. Illustrations were rare and expensive on political handbills in 1828, and the striking imagery of the coffins leant their name immediately to the handbill. Contemporary accounts contain at least as many references to the coffins as to the substance of the story of the six militiamen.

Measuring about 15 by 22 inches and heavily bordered in black, the handbill featured eighteen coffins. Six were arrayed across the top, each bearing the name of one of the slain militiamen. Seven anonymous coffins lined up below, one for each of the executed regulars. The story of John Woods is illustrated by the handbill's only horizontal coffin while Jackson's Indian victims are depicted by four smaller sarcophagi. The handbill's somber mood is further reinforced by heavy black borders which separate the individual incidents recounted. The Samuel Jackson story is illustrated not by a coffin, but by a woodcut showing Jackson running his unfortunate opponent through the back of the neck as the latter bends down to pick up a rock in self defense.

Binns' coffins were certainly provocative, but it may be that "their very looks were more likely to inspire horror of the man who issued them than a repugnance of the successful and popular general whose methods and practices were more in harmony with the mores of his people than Binns suspected."[20] In at least one state, New York, the distribution of the handbills was stopped by the Adams forces.[21] And the Liberty Hall reported that Jackson's men, too, armed themselves with Coffin Handbills, proclaiming them to be the work of Henry Clay. As Jacksonian editor Duff Green put it, the handbill was the work of Clay and John Quincy Adams, designed "to strip the honored laurel from [Jackson's] brow."[22]

Defending Jackson was the duty not only of partisan editors, but of well-organized Correspondence Committees, derogatorily dubbed the "white-wash committees" by the opposition. Rather than focusing on the veracity of the charges themselves, the committees and the party press editors concentrated on the "mudslinging" charge. The Coffin Handbill was just the sort of low political tactic to which the parties of the "corrupt bargain" would stoop. In addition, the handbill's substance provided opportunities to reinforce the general's military myth. One widely reprinted riposte observed: "COOL AND DELIBERATE MURDER. -- Jackson coolly and deliberately put to death upward of fifteen hundred British troops on the 8th of January, 1815, on the plains below New Orleans, for no other offense than that they wished to sup in the city that night."[23]

The Jackson forces also printed their own version of the bill, replete with six coffins across the top. In this parody, the "eyewitness" narrates the fact that Jackson not only ordered the execution of the men, but "swallowed them whole, coffins and all, without the slightest attempt at mastication!!!!!!"[24] A contemporary cartoon depicts Binns staggering under the weight of six coffins, President Adams and Henry Clay. "Hold on Jonny," Clay cries from atop his tottering perch. "I find that the people are too much for us, and I'm sinking with Jack and his Coffins!" Adams, holding a gilt chair symbolizing the presidency, says, "I'll hang on to the chair, Harry, in spite of Coffin hand-bills Harris's letter Panama mission or the wishes of the People." Binns, struggling to keep the two politicos and the coffins aloft, answers "I must have an extra dose of Treasury-pap, or down go the Coffins Harry, for I feel faint already."[25]

As the campaign progressed, anti-Jackson editors responded by reprinting their own versions of the handbill, adding materials they felt would help substantiate the charges made. A reprint issued by *Our Country* at Hagerstown, Maryland on Oct. 18, 1828 included seven offers for $20 rewards to anyone able to disprove the charges contained in the handbill. "[W]here is the impropriety? -- where is the infamy?" *Our Country* asked. "[O]n the contrary, there is virtue in proclaiming the deep-dark-cold-chilling-damning facts".[26] Another supporting pamphlet was published by Jonathan Eliot, and its title attempted to give official imprimatur to the sordid story within:

> Official Record from the War Department of the Proceedings of the Court Martial which Tried, and the Orders of General Jackson for Shooting the Six Militiamen, together with Official Letters from the War Department, (Ordered to be printed by Congress) Showing that these American Citizens were Inhumanly and Illegally Massacred.[27]

These tactics, however, did little to bolster the arguments contained in the handbill. The truth of the charges was not so much the issue, but the character of Gen. Jackson. Those predisposed to Old Hickory might well find in the handbill further reasons to support him. Such reliance on questionable "official documents" might also further reinforce the image of a corrupt administration willing to stoop to forgery to discredit its opposition.

The handbill certainly garnered little popular support for Binns. As the author recalled later, "It may well be doubted whether there ever was a publication which brought upon the publisher such active, general, and intense odium as those coffin handbills brought upon the writer of these recollections."[28] The night Philadelphia cast its ballots for Jackson electors, Binns received word that a mob was heading toward the offices of his newspaper and in order "to punish the editor appropriately for his coffin handbills, an empty coffin should forthwith be procured, and taken with them, in order to put the editor of the "Press" into it and carry him round the town."[29] Binns and his wife escaped to the roof of the building, and peering over the edge of the coping stone, "saw the front door of the coffin, without a lid, in which it was proposed to carry me round the city, or land me, or water me, I knew not where."[30] After two or three hours, "the rioters slunk away in squads, taking with them the coffin,"[31] but returned the next night, by which time the unpopular editor and his family had taken refuge with friends.

The scene is characteristic of a political climate far more intense than our own. The 1828 election saw a significant increase in voter participation, from 9 percent in 1820 and 26.9 percent in 1924 to 57.6 percent of the eligible white males.[32] Although local issues had always sparked interest, concern with national politics was something new, and the election marked the transition to more participatory democracy on a national level.[33]

The Jacksonian period was one in which "legions of men talked politics, argued politics, listened to two- and three-hour speeches, churned out political pamphlets and public letters"[34]. It was a society obsessed with politics, a society in which politics and religion were the national pastimes, the emotional outlets of the people. As one modern historian put it: "In the morality play which politics had become in the period, it was necessary to create simple concrete representations of the varied and moral motives and political arguments of the world."[35] The Coffin Handbill was one attempt to create such a commingling of political and religious symbolism with its praying militiamen, one significantly a Baptist preacher.

The florid prose of the handbill itself, like the parody and hyperbole of the responses to it, was a common rhetorical device of the time. Indeed, exaggeration and melodrama were in keeping with the almost obsessive interest in politics. If the unifying theme of the handbill is death, it is death treated in a certain way. Early 19th century America was a society familiar with death; high infant mortality rates, shorter lifespan, Indian wars and public executions all made death very nearly a matter of everyday life. The drama of the militiamen lay not so much in their demise, but in the details of their executions and the manner in which they met their ends.

In a reference to modern spectator sport, Wilcomb Washburn has called 19th century political campaigns "The Great Autumnal Madness."[36] Like the rhetoric that surrounds a championship game, political campaigns were characterized by short-term passions of the most ferocious kind. Political attacks like the handbill, the aspersions on Jackson's mother and the allegations concerning Negro blood may well have been concocted in the spirit of such exaggeration and need to be evaluated in light of the kinds of discourse that were acceptable in that era.

The partisan nature of the Jacksonian press also contributed to the tenor of the era's political discourse. Subsidized by the parties and often political officials themselves, editors were advocates, not disseminators of balanced political information. The newly formed political parties reflected the new concerns of the electorate, and as Baldasty has pointed out, the press was the central means by which parties attempted "to marshal public opinion to their policies and ideals."[37] The use of correspondence committees and party press editors may have also encouraged attacks by giving the candidate a certain "plausible deniability," to use the modern phrase.

As concerns moved from the local to the national arena, mass media developed, spurred forward by the increase in post roads, the postal subsidy of newspapers, and the free exchange of journals between editors. "The influence and circulation of newspapers is great beyond any thing ever known in Europe," English traveler Thomas Hamilton wrote. "Every village, nay, almost every hamlet, has its press, which issues secondhand news, and serves as an arena in which the political gladiators of the neighbourhood may exercise their powers of argument and abuse."[38]

Tocqueville observed that "in America the press has the same destructive tastes as in France and the same violence without the same reasons for anger."[39] Unlike France, Jacksonian America lacked the divisive, intractable political issues that threaten revolution, despite the violence of the periodical press. "American political life," Tocqueville wrote, "is active, varied and even agitated, but it is seldom disturbed by deep passions."[40] Thus, attacks like the Coffin Handbill might seem to modern readers serious, vitriolic, and even threatening of the democratic ideal. But the handbill and other attacks were not symbolic of deeper divisions in society. They could temporarily excite the passions without causing lasting scars in the body politic. Moreover, such attacks must have seemed commonplace in context of the press of the early 19th Century. At one point, John H. Eaton reassured Old Hickory that the slanders of the opposition had little effect: "The Press has overturned its own power, through repeated falsehood and slander."[41]

To say there were factors favoring emotional appeals and a highly partisan press, however, is not the same thing as saying political discourse would be personal and nasty. There were in fact, factors present in early American political thought that would seem to mitigate against such negative campaigns. Although the newspaper duels between Jefferson and Hamilton are well-known, these might be dismissed as the "growing pains" of the fledgling nation. They were in fact followed by an "era of good feelings," the presidency of James Monroe. Although Monroe was attacked by the partisan press, these attacks "were less personal and less vitriolic than those upon his predecessor Jefferson."[42]

The political ideal of the young nation was one of consensus, not confrontation; "antipartyism ran deep in Revolutionary thought, based on the belief that politics had debased England."[43] As a result, candidates themselves avoided the appearance of politicking. To be sure, involvement in campaigning or even clear-cut positions on issues might be interpreted as an unseemly interest in politics. It may be that highly personal attacks were attempts to goad the candidate into personal responses. Jackson himself must have thought so when he wrote Richard Johnson in September 1828:

> My enemies would delight to seeing me now entering upon an electioneering tour, it would realise the saying ascribed to Mr Adams, "that he would turn democrat and urge them into such extravagance that the whole people would become disgusted with our government, and cry out or a change".[44]

This avoidance of issues on the part of candidates conversely made their own character and overall fitness for office the central issue of the campaign.

Conclusion

There were, of course, substantive issues in the election of 1828, just as there was also the shallowest of image electioneering. But it is difficult to separate these strains of political discourse. One may evolve from the other, as the Coffin Handbill itself became an issue in 1828 or the "Monster Bank" became a significant symbol four years later.

It is a long-accepted truism that in politics, mud sticks on those who throw it. At first glance, the history of the Coffin Handbill would seem to confirm this notion. But it also suggests that the effect of negative political discourse depends on how such messages interact with the attitudes and preconceptions of the voters. Allen reassuringly wrote Jackson that, "There will be no charges, at least among your friends; abuse of you, tends but the stronger to confirm them".[45] But this does not mean that all attacks similarly backfired. While the anti-Jackson forces threw the majority of the mud in 1828, the hands of the general's supporters were far from clean. There is truth underlying the complaint of the anti-Jackson National Journal that, "All the arts of deception were employed to mislead the public mind as well in relation to the members of the last Administration, as to his own character and competency to bring about a reform which was supposed to be necessary."[46]

Negative political discourse may well have brought out the vote on both sides, by reinforcing existing attitudes. As Remini has observed: "The revitalization of party practices and procedures resulted in the introduction of new forms of campaigning, including the worst horrors of American electioneering; yet many of these procedures encouraged the people to vote and thus stimulated the habit of democracy."[47]

Binns and other anti-Jackson editors may have understood that the nation was entering a new era of popular politics. But they failed to understand the small farmers who formed 80 percent of the electorate in 1828, and that may have cost the Adams forces the election. Truth's Advocate and Monthly Anti-Jackson Expositor, for instance, argued that the general's "whole recommendation is animal fierceness and organic energy,"[48] qualities the Coffin Handbill sought to portray as negative. What Binns and the other anti-Jackson editors failed to grasp was that these qualities were indeed enough for many. John Binns may have understood the need to attack the general's military reputation; he just didn't know how to go about it.

Despite the demise of the political press in America, personal attacks remain a significant form of political discourse. Today these messages exist as paid political advertising. In some ways, this advertising is the functional equivalent of the partisan press; as subsidized mass media, they are closer to our conception of political spot ads than to our modern notions of objective journalism. Politicians then, as candidates now, might decry the excesses perpetrated in their name, but their campaign organizations must bear ultimate responsibility. Rather than buy space in a newspaper as do candidates or their representatives today, early 19th century politicos simply bought newspapers to disseminate their position and rally voters to their cause.

Finally, the election of 1828 suggests that modern candidates who avoid substantive issues and increasingly on image to appeal to voters should not be surprised when those very images -- their character and personality -- become the central issue of the political campaign.

The widespread use of such tactics says something about the nature of politics. Political symbols - be they coffins and Hickory polls or flags and furloughs -- may do more to stimulate the electorate than reasoned discussion of the weighty issues of the day. Klein has written that

> when we think of the campaign of 1828, we must bear in mind . . . the magic effect of a "Huzza for Andy Jackson!" which in many cases was the sole and all sufficient reason for casting an Old Hickory ballot. How often does a carefully reasoned appeal drift listlessly down an empty alley while a meaningless slogan roars triumphant across the countryside![49]

Notes

[1] "The Smear Campaign," *Newsweek* 31 Oct. 1988: 17.

[2] Robert Remini, *The Election of Andrew Jackson*. (Philadelphia: J.J. Lippincott, 1963) 153.

[3] Paul F. Boller, *Presidential Campaigns* (New York: Oxford U.P. 1984) 45.

[4] Culver H. Smith, "Propaganda Technique in the Jackson Campaign of 1828," *East Tennessee Historical Society Publications* 6 (1934): 49.

[5] "The Smear Campaign" 18.

[6] Kathleen Jamieson, *Packaging the Presidency* (New York: Oxford UP 1984) 12.

[7] James Parton, *The Life of Andrew Jackson* 3 vols. (New York: Mason Brothers 1861) 3: 137.

[8] Parton 3: 139.

[9] Andrew Jackson, "To Edward Livingston," 12 Jan. 1828, *The Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, ed. John S. Bassett, 6 vols. (Washington D.C.: Carnegie Institution, 1928) 3: 389.

[10] Andrew Jackson, "To James Allen," 31 March 1827. Bassett 3: 350.

[11] Jackson, "To James Allen," Bassett 3: 350.

[12] John Binns, *Recollections of the Life of John Binns* (Philedelphia: Printed by the Author and Parry and M'Millan 1854) 245.

[13] Alexander Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. George Lawrence, eds. J.P. Mayer and Max Lerner (New York: Harper and Row 1966) 256.

[14] Binns 245.

[15] Binns 246.

[16] Smith 61.

[17] A copy of the Coffin Handbill may be seen at the Library of Congress, Division of Manuscripts in the collection of broadsides, vol 229. The quotes from the handbill used in this paper are taken from the version reprinted as an appendix in Bassett, 3: 455-464; and from the reproduction of the handbill itself in Stefan Lorant, *The Presidency* (New York: McMillan 1951) 105.

[18] Remini, 159.

[19] Remini, 159.

[20] Smith 61.

[21] Thurlow Weed, *The Autobiography of Thurlow Weed* (Boston, 1884) 308-09.

[22] Remini 155.

[23] Parton 3: 144.

[24] Jamieson 7.

[25] Lorant 1106-07.

[26] Bassett, 3: 457.

[27] Smith 62.

[28] Binns 246.

[29] Binns 255.

[30] Binns 255-56.

[31] Binns 255.

[32] William N. Chambers and Philip C. Davis, "Party, competition and Mass Participation: The Case of the Democratizing Party System 1824-1852," *The History of American Electoral Behavior*, eds. Joel H. Silbey, et al., (Princeton: Princeton UP 1978) 174-175.

[33] Thomas Bender, *Community and Social Change in America* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP 1978).

[34] Chambers and Davis 178.

[35] Wilcomb E. Washburn. "The Great Autumnal Madness: Political Symbolism in Mid Nineteenth-Century America," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 49 (1963): 423.

[36] Washburn 417.

[37] Gerald Baldasty, "The Press and Politics in the Age of Jackson," *Journalism Monographs* 89 (1984): 2.

[38] Thomas Hamilton, *Men and Manners in America* 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1833) 2: 72-73.

[39] Tocqueville 168.

[40] Tocqueville 169.

[41] John H. Eaton, "To Andrew Jackson," Bassett, 3: 429.

[42] Frank Luther Mott, *American Journalism* (New York: McMillan) 175.

[43] Baldasty 2.

[44] Jackson, "To Richard Johnson," Bassett 3: 431.

[45] Allen, "To Andrew Jackson," Bassett, 3: 429.

[46] Smith 45.

[47] Remini 203.

[48] Smith 56.

[49] Philip Shriver Klein, *Pennsylvania Politics 1817-1832: A Game Without Rules*, diss., U Pennsylvania, 1940, (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania) 250.

Gilson Gardner: A Partisan Reporter in the Election of 1912

Stephen Ponder
School of Journalism
University of Oregon

Presented to the History Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications, August 1990, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

The subject of partisanship in news coverage of presidential elections remains a sensitive one in the late twentieth century. The bulk of the "national" press corps which covers presidential campaigns for daily newspapers, news services and broadcasting, consists of Washington, D.C., reporters who regard themselves as nonpartisan, more or less objective and free from political directives from their editors, at least when compared with political reporters earlier in the century.[1]

Moreover, the process of campaign reporting itself discourages writing news stories from divergent or partisan viewpoints. Timothy Crouse, in his 1972 book, The Boys on the Bus, described how reporters avoided offending potential news sources among candidates and campaign officials. Stories that deviated from the relatively neutral accounts of the news services, especially the Associated Press, were also avoided because they could leave the reporters subject to inquiries from their editors.[2]

These professional and procedural barriers against overt partisanship underscore the significance of a suggestion by David Broder of the Washington Post that political reporters act deliberately to influence the discourse of presidential campaigns. Broder, perhaps the most widely read political correspondent among his peers, wrote that he was dismayed with the superficial discussion of issues in the presidential campaign of 1988. He appealed to reporters to substitute their own agendas of campaign issues for those of the candidates and their campaign managers.[3] Broder's suggestion follows years of increasing concern among both journalists and media critics that whatever ability that news organizations once held to influence the public agenda has been diminished by political candidates and government officials skilled in managing the news.[4]

What Broder is suggesting, in effect, is that political reporters become partisans of a sort -- advocates for a change in the campaign discourse. To advocate changing the discourse does not necessarily involve writing stories that favor a particular candidate or a political party. Nevertheless, proposing that modern political reporters become overtly partisan, even in a limited way, represents a break from the ideal of objectivity which has strongly affected American journalism in the late twentieth century.[5] Such a change also could have important implications for the elaborate process by which Americans choose their presidents. As Nelson W. Polsby has pointed out, recent changes in nominating procedures by the national political parties already have significantly increased the influence of the news media in the selection of presidential candidates.[6]

From a historical perspective, the press has been an important and frequently partisan voice in president elections since the earliest days of the nation.[7] Until recently, the press' partisan role in American political history was obscured by a tendency among some journalism historians to view the past through the presentist lens of objectivity.[8] Re-examination of the party press in the nineteenth century, however, has revealed that partisan newspapers were the center of American political life and contributed to the creation of national political parties.[9]

The purpose of this study is to examine partisanship in political reporting early in the twentieth century, the period which the historian George Mowry describes as the birth of modern America, to seek context for the current debate over presidential campaign journalism.[10]

Historical inquiry into the emergence of political reporting as a professional subspecialty in American journalism has been limited. The political role of the daily press at the beginning of the twentieth century has been previously discussed in terms of the personal crusades of great editors.[11] Yet this period was important in the development of reporting generally and Washington, D.C., reporting in particular.[12] The historian Thomas C. Leonard argues that the heritage of political reporting through the Progressive Period set the course of the profession. After the muckrakers severely criticized the corruption of political parties and the government, reporters became more detached from the party system and more inclined to point out the faults and inconsistencies of political leaders.[13] Moreover, the sociologist Herbert J. Gans suggests that stories by the national news media continue to reflect the enduring reformist values of this formative era.[14]

Partisanship among commercial daily newspapers at the turn of the century differed from that of the earlier party press, at least in part because the newspapers were no longer dependent on financial subsidies. Increasing numbers of newspapers had declared themselves "independent" of one political party or another, a move which had advantages in attracting advertising but did not necessarily mean a lessening of partisan advocacy.[15] Activist publishers continued to lead political crusades and to participate in the selection and promotion of particular candidates. The differences between news stories and editorial writing were minimal in this period, and editors closely oversaw reporters' stories on political topics.[16]

Partisanship was characteristic of the growing Washington, D.C., press corps as well. The historian Donald A. Ritchie suggests that the work of Washington, D.C., correspondents reflected both the directives of their newspapers and close relationships with leaders of the House and Senate. Reporters frequently accepted patronage appointments between congressional sessions and worked on political campaigns. Members of Congress were sometimes the owners of the newspapers for which the reporters worked.[17]

Personal accounts from this period offer additional evidence that reporters who worked for partisan newspapers routinely shaped their stories to comply with the newspaper's politics. O.O. Stealey, a Washington, D.C., correspondent for 20 years, described in his 1906 memoir how he and another correspondent who shared telegraph time alternated in sending partisan stories to their respectively Democratic and Republican newspapers.[18]

However, while political reporters at the turn of the century were frequently partisan in their stories, they had only a limited ability to make those judgments independently. David S. Barry, who was both a newspaper correspondent and a Republican political appointee at various times from 1879 to 1919, was taken aback when Theodore Roosevelt asked him why reporters didn't resign when newspaper editorial policies changed. "He seemed to make no allowances for the fact that the correspondent must of necessity earn a living," Barry wrote. "Or the possibility that his views, if he had any, might change with those of the newspaper he served."[19]

To explore more fully the role of a political reporter in this period, this study focuses on one prominent Washington, D.C., correspondent, Gilson Gardner. Gardner was the chief political writer for the Newspaper Enterprise Association, the feature service of the E.W. Scripps newspapers, one of the nation's first newspaper chains. As a partisan reporter, Gardner was deeply involved, professionally and personally, in the reform movement that led to the campaign by Theodore Roosevelt as the Progressive

Party candidate in 1912.

The inquiry also examined the professional and political contexts of Gardner's role. His relationships with both his employer and his political patrons were documented by examining correspondence in several archival collections. Because Scripps led a reclusive life at his Southern California estate during this period, he and Gardner communicated primarily by letter. These letters are preserved in the newly opened E.W. Scripps Papers at Ohio University. Gardner also corresponded frequently with Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, Robert M. Lafollette Sr., and other Progressive leaders. This extensive correspondence was compared with the stories that Gardner wrote for the Newspaper Enterprise Association. Stories under Gardner's byline from 1908 through 1912 were read in two of Scripps' West Coast papers: the Portland, Oregon, News, and the San Diego, California, Sun, the closest Scripps paper to the publisher's estate at Miramar.

The role of the partisan reporter suggested by the case study was a complex one. Gardner was more or less simultaneously a reporter of news, a political agent of Scripps, an advisor to presidential campaigns, organizer of a third party movement, a campaign worker, and, personally, a reformer. He was a significant part of the political process, rather than a detached observer, and openly so.

The intricacy of the role is suggested by a letter that Gardner sent to Gifford Pinchot, in 1911 the presidential campaign manager for Sen. Robert M. LaFollette of Wisconsin. Gardner wrote:

"I am planning to take a little trip through some of the Southern states to see if I can spread any disaffection among the Southern delegates (to the 1912 Republican National Convention) and likewise to get some news."[20]

Gardner's role was shaped primarily by his employer, E.W. Scripps. Scripps was a politically active publisher in the spirit of William Randolph Hearst.[21] Unlike Hearst, Scripps had no personal ambitions for public office. But he was interested in national affairs as a self-styled radical and defender of the working class. Scripps had, for example, instructed the editor of his Spokane, Washington, Press, George Putnam, to be an "advocate and special pleader of the laboring and poor classes as against the whole plutocratic and aristocratic combinations, political, economic and social."[22] In the elections of 1908 and 1912, Eugene V. Debs, the labor leader and third party candidate, was included among the presidential candidates portrayed fully by the Scripps newspapers.[23] Although he was nominally a Democrat, Scripps remained independent of the party organization. He supported local and national reform movements in both major political parties. In 1906, he founded the Denver Express to aid Ben K. Lindsey and other Democratic reformers in Colorado. He also was a strong supporter of Roosevelt, a Republican.

In early 1908, however, Scripps was losing hope that reformers would lead either the Democratic or Republican parties in the upcoming campaign. Roosevelt had refused to run for a third term in the White House. Scripps feared that the president's chosen successor, the conservative William Howard Taft, would undo the Roosevelt reforms. As for the Democrats, the party had been in disarray on the national level since losing control of Congress in 1894 and the presidency in 1896. In 1908, the Democrats were again to nominate William Jennings Bryan, who had lost twice before. Scripps liked Bryan's populism but doubted that he could win the election.

In a long letter to W.B. Colver, the general manager of the Newspaper Enterprise Association, Scripps wrote despairingly about the political situation. His newspapers would support Bryan in 1908, but unenthusiastically. He wrote: "I have about made up my mind ... to the idea that there is no political party or politician at present in sight which is entitled to my entire respect and confidence." What was needed was "real democracy" for the powerless, a revolution against "the rule of capital."[24]

To achieve that goal, given the conservative, business-oriented leadership of the two major political parties, Scripps thought what was needed was a third party to draw together both Democratic and Republican reformers, especially Progressive Republicans like Roosevelt, to unite behind a fusion candidate for president in 1912.

Scripps decided to use his publishing empire to advocate such a campaign. The E.W. Scripps organization in late 1911 included 24 daily newspapers, primarily in the Midwest and on the West Coast; the Newspaper Enterprise Association, which furnished features and editorials to the Scripps newspapers, and the United Press news service, which reached hundreds of afternoon newspaper subscribers across the country.[25] In a letter to Gifford Pinchot in 1910, Scripps wrote:

> ...I have the ear -- or perhaps I should say the eye -- of more than a million voters in this country, and if I live I will have many more, and in my peculiar way and by my own peculiar methods I shall continue such a propaganda as will hope, and even expect, result in there being leaders of the people who will be prepared some day to venture a platform not one whit less radical than this one I am sending you. I have learned how effective is the instrument I have in my possession.[26]

To direct the Newspaper Enterprise Association to promote his political aims editorially, Scripps wrote frequently to Colver, the general manager. For news stories on politics for the Scripps newspapers, he relied upon Gardner, the chief political reporter.

Gardner, a graduate of Northwestern University who turned to newspapering instead of practicing law, had moved to Washington, D.C., in the first years of the century as a reporter for the Chicago Journal and other Chicago newspapers.[27] Like other Washington, D.C., correspondents of this era, Gardner took a patronage appointment for financial support when Congress was not in session. For five months in 1902, Gardner was on the payroll of the Senate Committee on Territories under the patronage of Sen. Albert J. Beveridge of Indiana. Gardner helped Thomas R. Shipp, chief aide to the committee, to prepare a magazine article on the selection of Beveridge's Indiana rival, Charles W. Fairbanks, to become Roosevelt's vice president.[28] In 1904, Gardner applied to Gifford Pinchot for part-time work, on space rates, in the press office of the Bureau of Forestry.[29]

These patronage connections indicate that Gardner had aligned himself with the Progressive Republican leaders in Washington, a group which included Beveridge, Pinchot and, especially, Roosevelt. Alliance with -- and access to -- the Roosevelt White House brought Gardner to the attention of the Newspaper Enterprise Association, which hired him in 1905.[30]

In Gardner's 1932 biography of Scripps, he wrote that his first instructions at the Newspaper Enterprise Association were to write stories promoting the activities of then-President Roosevelt, whom Scripps admired. "There were many months when (Gardner) had no duties except to keep in touch with Roosevelt and to help on his political purposes," Gardner wrote. He became a regular at Roosevelt's informal "shaving hour" news conferences in the White House, for which he was labeled as one of the "fair-haired boys," whose stories reflected Roosevelt's thinking.[31]

Gardner's stories about the Roosevelt administration pleased both Scripps and Roosevelt. After the national nominating conventions in 1908, Scripps summoned Gardner to California for a rare personal audience. Scripps told Gardner how pleased he was with his work -- and how unhappy he was that Roosevelt had selected Taft to be his successor.[32] Gardner's subsequent stories surrounding the election and inauguration of Taft reflected his employer's dismay.[33]

By mid-summer 1909, four months into the Taft administration, Scripps was sufficiently alarmed about Taft's policies to set in motion both the campaign for a third party reform movement and a search for a suitable presidential candidate in 1912. Both actions were paralleled by Gardner stories.[34]

Scripps was encouraged by a September 1909 visit to Miramar by Gifford Pinchot, the forester and advisor to Roosevelt. Pinchot, who had remained chief of the Forest Service after Roosevelt left the presidency, was finding his position in the Taft administration increasingly untenable. Pinchot was intrigued with Scripps' proposal for a third-party reform campaign but felt it was premature. After the visit, Gardner wrote several stories from Washington, D.C., that supported Pinchot's cause in the Taft administration.[35]

In January 1910, Taft fired Pinchot. The firing alienated the Roosevelt reformers from the Taft administration and gave life to the third party movement.[36] Under the leadership of Pinchot, a campaign was quickly organized to inform Roosevelt, who was on an extended safari, of these developments. Scripps, convinced that Roosevelt would be the strongest reform candidate in 1912, assigned Gardner to carry the appeals to Roosevelt in Africa.[37]

The foreign assignment was a challenging one, and it began an expansion of Gardner's role beyond routine Washington, D.C., reporting. In addition to writing news stories about Roosevelt's return from safari, Gardner was to talk confidentially with Roosevelt to find out if Roosevelt was willing to re-enter politics. In his biography of Scripps, Gardner described how he and a handful of other correspondents chartered a steamboat in

Khartoum to sail upstream to meet Roosevelt's boat coming down the White Nile. After talking with Roosevelt, Gardner cabled Scripps a code word, "hen," that indicated Roosevelt was willing to say in confidence that he might be interested in re-entering politics. Gardner also cabled a 100-word news story, at the rate of one dollar a word, paid in advance and in gold.[38]

Gardner's news stories and photographs of Roosevelt from Africa, distributed through the Newspaper Enterprise Association, were generously displayed by the Scripps newspapers, beginning on 14 March 1910. Over the next three months, 22 bylined stories from Gardner were published in the San Diego Sun that described Roosevelt's triumphant procession across Europe and his meeting with Pinchot in Italy. On days when no Gardner stories were available, the Sun and the Portland News printed feature photographs of Roosevelt. Accompanying Gardner's stories were editorials that urged Roosevelt to run again for president.[39]

In Europe, Gardner negotiated with Roosevelt over the planning for a national speaking tour once the former president returned to the United States. The tour would promote the success of reform political candidates in November 1910 and serve as a kickoff for the 1912 presidential campaign. Roosevelt was interested, Gardner cabled back, but needed a financial guarantee. Scripps ordered Colver to send Gardner $5,000.[40]

In June 1910, Roosevelt returned to a royal welcome in New York City. Gardner, back in Washington, D.C., wrote proudly to Scripps: "I believed months ago that we had at hand the dynamite to blow out of power the special clique of privilege who now control the government."[41]

Before the speaking tour began, however, Roosevelt met with President Taft and drew back from making a formal break with Taft or the Republican Party. He went on to deliver his radical "New Nationalism" speech at Osawatomie, Kansas, in late August but then stunned many of his Progressive followers by compromising with conservatives on the party platform adopted by the New York State Republican convention in late September.[42] Even before the New York convention, Scripps was angered by Roosevelt's reluctance to break with Taft. Scripps at first accepted, then decided not to attend, a meeting with Roosevelt that Gardner had arranged in Denver, Colorado. He wrote to Gardner that the reform movement could survive without Roosevelt if necessary.[43]

Scripps' unhappiness with Roosevelt placed Gardner in a difficult position, caught between his employer, his admiration for Roosevelt, and his pragmatic view of the political situation. He tried unsuccessfully to persuade Scripps that Roosevelt, although flawed, was nevertheless the strongest candidate the reformers had. Scripps was unforgiving.[44] Gardner concentrated on writing stories about the 1910 congressional campaigns and did not return to presidential campaign topics until after the November election. By that time, Roosevelt, unhappy over the poor Republican showing, was no longer willing to discuss entering the 1912 presidential campaign.

Scripps, however, had not given up hope for the third party campaign. Gardner, in another expansion of his duties, was assigned to organize the campaign with LaFollette, instead of Roosevelt, as the likely candidate. After getting Roosevelt's tacit approval, Gardner wrote back to Scripps that LaFollette seemed to be the best remaining Progressive candidate: "All the rest have wavered."[45]

Before Scripps endorsed LaFollette, however, Gardner interviewed and reported back to Scripps on other prospects for the reform candidacy, including Woodrow Wilson, Louis Brandeis and Pinchot.[46] On 2 January 1911, Scripps distributed a letter of support for LaFollette that noted that Roosevelt was "not radical enough" and endorsed a third-party approach.[47]

Gardner, meanwhile, had begun to organize what became the National Progressive Republican League. In early December 1910, Gardner met with Pinchot and LaFollette to prepare a list of probable members of the "Progressive League" and to seek financial contributions. In a report to Scripps on 19 December, Gardner prophetically suggested the outlines of an organization that would start from within the Republican Party and hope to control the party's 1912 national convention. If the Progressives lost at the national convention, the League would become the nucleus for a third-party presidential campaign in the general election. In a followup report on 30 December, Gardner he noted that he had collected $10,000 each from Pinchot and William Kent, a California Progressive.

Gardner also arranged for a meeting between Roosevelt and key Progressives, at which Roosevelt assured them he had no presidential ambitions at that point. In a third report, in early January, Gardner outlined final preparations for the National Progressive Republican League's inaugural meeting later in the month in Washington, D.C. During these active weeks of backstage political organizing, no stories on the subject by Gardner appeared in either the San Diego or Portland newspapers.[48]

After the founding meeting, held 21 January 1911 at LaFollette's home in Washington, D.C., Gardner wrote a story announcing formation of the League. As was the custom in Washington, D.C., reporting at the time, Gardner's story quoted no one directly, did not name those in attendance and omitted the location of the meeting. It did note that "there is a strong feeling in Washington that the men whose signatures are appended to the League's announcement are men who believe in LaFollette as a pioneer of Progressivism." Gardner followed up the founding story with two stories in February 1911 that more firmly identified LaFollette as the likely Progressive League candidate.[49]

Once the League campaign was under way, Gardner became an unofficial advisor to Pinchot, who was the campaign manager, and a traveling organizer for LaFollette -- all while continuing to write stories for NEA and to keep Scripps informed on his activities. The Progressive League files in the Pinchot Papers indicate that Gardner wrote numerous articles and speeches for campaign use. Gardner also regularly advised Pinchot on publicity matters.[50]

In April 1911, Gardner traveled to Chicago on LaFollette's behalf to meet with potential Progressive delegates there. In an introductory letter to John Hicks, LaFollette described Gardner as a "close personal friend with whom you can talk as freely and confidentially as you would with me." He outlined Gardner's expanded role:

> While Mr. Gardner is the Washington representative of the Newspaper Enterprise Association, and through this medium commands the largest publicity organization of any newspaper man in the country, yet he is an important factor in the advisory counsel, so to speak, of our Progressive group here in Washington. ... Nothing which you say to him will be given any publicity excepting with your consent and my approval.[51]

In September 1911, Gardner made a similar trip to Midwest states holding primary elections. A three-page itinerary for Gardner was prepared by the LaFollette campaign staff. It told Gardner where to go and whom to talk to among reform leaders in Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Minnesota and Wisconsin. He was given another introductory letter from LaFollette which described him as "a friend with whom you can talk freely, and his mission meets our plans and approval."[52]

After the Midwest trip, Gardner wrote a series of stories which asserted that Taft could not win the Republican nomination, based on his interviews with the potential delegates in those states. The final installment, carried on the front pages of both the Portland News and the San Diego Sun, declared that Taft was beaten and that LaFollette was the probable nominee of the Republicans in 1912.[53] In late October 1911, Gardner made a similar trip to interview delegates in the southern states.[54]

During the same period, Gardner was regularly filing routine news stories from Washington, D.C., for NEA on the deliberations of Congress or the Supreme Court. An informal reading of the Portland News and the San Diego Sun for 1911, however, indicates that many of these stories were also critical of Taft on various issues.[55]

Gardner still considered himself a competitive newsman while serving as a campaign strategist, and this aspect of his role produced at least one conflict. In June 1911, Gardner startled leaders of the LaFollette campaign by sending out a news story through NEA which stated that LaFollette was about to declare his candidacy officially. LaFollette planned no such announcement. Gardner was reacting out of fear that he would be scooped by a competing correspondent, Clyde Tavenner, who sent stories from Washington, D.C., to about 1,240 weekly newspapers. Tavenner, who was based in the House Democratic Caucus, had filed a story predicting that LaFollette would make such an announcement. After Gardner's story appeared, John Hannan, chief Senate aide to LaFollette, complained to Gifford Pinchot that Gardner's surprise story left his office overwhelmed with press inquiries that he was unprepared to answer.[56]

The conflicts inherent in the complex role Gardner was pursuing became more serious after the LaFollette campaign faltered in late 1911, and Roosevelt began to show renewed interest in becoming a candidate.

LaFollette's accomplishments in the Republican caucuses and primaries in 1911 were substantial, but he failed to draw the support of many of the Roosevelt reformers, who became increasingly convinced that Roosevelt could be persuaded to enter the race. By January 1912, some of those reformers, who had been serving as the leaders of LaFollette's campaign, were ready to abandon him to work for Roosevelt.

When LaFollette, exhausted and apparently depressed over his daughter's health problems, angrily harangued the guests at a dinner of the Periodical Publishers Association on 2 February 1912 in Philadelphia, Pinchot, among others, declared that LaFollette's health had failed and that he should now withdraw from the campaign. Pinchot, who had been LaFollette's campaign manager, resigned to organize the campaign for Roosevelt. Gardner joined him. In a subsequent story for the Scripps newspapers, Gardner praised LaFollette for "leading the first charge" but said that the candidate was now a "sick man" who must now rest at doctor's orders. He wrote: "it is now up to Roosevelt to make good and show that LaFollette did not fight in vain."[57]

The story precipitated a crisis for Gardner which demonstrated that as a participant in campaign, he, as well as the candidates, was subject to public and private criticism for his actions. The story angered Scripps, who did not agree with his employee's judgment. It also outraged LaFollette, who had come to expect Gardner's loyalty in his campaign organization.

Scripps expected his correspondent's stories to continue to support LaFollette. He had long been aware of Gardner's closeness to Roosevelt but nevertheless assumed that Gardner would continue to comply with his employer's wishes.[58]

In a long, angry letter on 26 February, Scripps accused Gardner of focusing too much on LaFollette's personal failings and not paying enough attention to the issues that the candidate stood for. He wrote: "I think all of you who are politicians, or students of politicians, are to some extent weak in your judgment. You pay too much attention to the man part of the political leader, and not enough to what he stands for, or is supposed to stand for, by the public." He also accused Gardner of being excessively sympathetic to Roosevelt and suggested that Gardner take leave from his job as a reporter to write "strictly propaganda" for Roosevelt.[59]

Gardner's thoughtful reply, dated 7 March 1912, is quoted at length because of what it reveals about the viewpoint of a partisan reporter in this period. In the letter, Gardner insisted that he was not committed to any party or particular candidate, only to the common goal of reform that he shared with Scripps:

> I hope ... that you believe me when I say -- I say it with all the emphasis of which I am capable -- that I am not a follower of the personal fortunes of Col. Roosevelt or any other man. In doing my work as a trustee, to a limited extent, of your newspaper influence, I have had but one aim -- to throw the weight of your newspaper influence to wrest the power of government from the hands of Special Privilege and to restore it to the people.
> ...
> In this sense it has been my frank desire to use public men. Any man, congressman, senator or presidential candidate -- Republican or Democrat, prohibitionist or socialist -- if he will with sincerity and fidelity serve the purpose of our cause, he can have the benefit of our publicity.

Gardner claimed that he had remained independent of any financial and social obligations that might interfere with his loyalty to Scripps or to his own sense of appropriate behavior.

> "We long ago concluded that the social bribe is more dangerous because (it is) more insidious than the other kinds. There is nothing any public man can offer me that I want. Some people might think me insincere in saying this: but it is only because they not know what I know about public life and public office. I enjoy my independence. I should enjoy it even if the fight were a very much harder one to meet the daily needs. The other thing is bought at too high a price. If I have had any influence here in Washington, it has been because I have not followed personality and because my sincerity has been known and recognized.[60]

Gardner's letter must have impressed Scripps, because he allowed Gardner to continue writing pro-Roosevelt stories over his editors' objections. "That Gilson Gardner should advocate the choice of Mr. Roosevelt for president in our papers while editorially our papers are opposed to same, is not bad business and it is not bad journalism," Scripps wrote to his executives. He said that Gardner's closeness to Roosevelt made him more valuable to the organization. "As citizens and individuals we want to defeat Roosevelt and favor LaFollette and Wilson, or Bryan, perhaps. But as newspapermen we must keep our papers entirely clean from our prejudices and bias as we possibly can."[61]

While Gardner was defending himself privately for violating the political directives of his employer, he also was under public attack from the LaFollette campaign.

In 1911, Gardner, because of his personal association with Roosevelt, had carried messages between the former president and LaFollette on the issue of which of them should or should not be a candidate for president.[62] Whether the carefully worded messages from Roosevelt that Gardner delivered to LaFollette actually urged LaFollette to declare his candidacy is open to interpretation.[63]

In 1912, however, LaFollette was angry at the abandonment of his campaign by the Roosevelt Progressives. His counterattack focused on Roosevelt -- and Gardner. In late February, Walter L. Houser, who had replaced Pinchot as LaFollette's campaign manager, prepared and distributed a pamphlet that said LaFollette had only entered the presidential race after being urged to do so by Roosevelt -- in a message delivered to him by Gardner. The pamphlet charged that LaFollette had been betrayed. Houser repeated the allegations in a national speaking tour that was designed to help LaFollette's showing in the remaining presidential primary elections.[64]

To defend himself in this conflict among powerful political figures, Gardner turned to Roosevelt. He drafted a reply denying the Houser charges and sent it to Roosevelt on 19 February for suggestions. Gardner's cover letter noted that "it is not my idea that the letter be made public, unless controversy makes this step necessary. I shall not send the letter to Houser until I hear from you." Roosevelt, who was in New York, sent Gardner both a letter and a telegram asking for "certain changes in that letter before sending it to Houser." Roosevelt asked Gardner to see him as soon as possible. Gardner agreed, saying "I will not make a second draft of the letter until I have seen and talked with you." Once Gardner's letter was re-written to Roosevelt's satisfaction, it was published by the Roosevelt campaign in the form of an open letter to Houser. The letter was widely distributed in the primary election states where Houser had delivered his charges, along with a campaign pamphlet for Roosevelt.[65]

These conflicts suggest that Gardner's presence in the political process meant that he, like the other participants, was open to criticism as part of the discourse of campaigning. Gardner was openly an advocate of Roosevelt, and his response to being caught up in the thrust and counterthrust between LaFollette and Roosevelt was consistent with his role as a partisan.

What effect, if any, the Houser incident had on the nominating process itself is uncertain. Roosevelt's declaration of candidacy drew away much of LaFollette's support. By the end of March 1912, Scripps acknowledged that "LaFollette now seems to be impossible."[66] Gardner continued to work for Roosevelt's nomination until the Taft victory at the Republican convention, then joined Roosevelt's Progressive Party campaign. Stories about the Roosevelt campaign under Gardner's byline continued to appear in the Scripps newspapers.[67]

The collapse of the LaFollette campaign eased Gardner's tensions with Scripps. The mercurial publisher had lost interest in the election by the Republican national convention, even though the walkout of Roosevelt Progressives to mount a third-party campaign paralleled the course that he had advocated nearly three years before. Unable to overcome his distrust of Roosevelt, Scripps in the general election let his editors endorse either Roosevelt or Woodrow Wilson, by then the Democratic candidate. Gardner was left to write in his post-election story that while Roosevelt lost, the results were a victory for the Progressive cause.[68]

After the election, Scripps and Gardner reconciled their differences, although Gardner briefly had second thoughts about his role in the campaign. Declining Scripps' offer to finance a book that Gardner wanted to write, he wrote: "You got me into a lot of trouble in getting me into the business of making presidents and I am glad to be well out of it."[69]

Despite his post-election disclaimer, Gardner continued to serve as Scripps' political correspondent and operative. He was active again in the election of 1916, when the Scripps newspapers contributed significantly to Wilson's narrow re-election victory.[70]

Examination of Gardner's activities in the election of 1912 indicates that his role as a partisan reporter was both complex and significant to the political process. Gardner was at various times a reporter on Washington, D.C., affairs for the Scripps newspapers; a political operative on behalf of his publisher and of presidential candidates, and an aide to political leaders and campaign managers who were sympathetic to the reform cause. He wrote stories that promoted the Progressive viewpoint and helped to organize a political movement that ultimately made the strongest showing of a third party in a twentieth century presidential election.

As a partisan reporter in the campaign of 1912, then, Gardner presents an intriguing contrast to the campaign journalism of the late twentieth century. Writing in a period that predates the notion of objectivity, Gardner was an advocate, professionally and personally, on behalf of particular candidates and policies. He was openly a part of the political process, rather than a detached observer, and his stories contributed to the vigorous campaign discourse in 1912.

The inquiry also adds historical context to the debate over whether the news media should overtly influence the discourse of presidential campaign in the late twentieth century.

This study and previous re-examinations of the partisan press confirm that the press has been a participant -- and frequently an advocate -- in presidential elections through most of American political history. Political advocacy in the press began with the first years of the nation and continued in nineteenth century party newspapers. What this case study suggests is that the advocacy role extended into the twentieth century as well, even though commercial newspapers had declared themselves officially independent of political parties and employed reporters to write their news stories about presidential campaigns. If Gardner's case is indicative, reporters, as well as editors, were partisans in twentieth century presidential campaigns prior to the ideal of objectivity. Only in the late twentieth century has objectivity, rather than advocacy, become a goal in stories informing citizens about the political process.

From a historical perspective, then, the suggestion that contemporary reporters advocate a change in the discourse in presidential campaigns is a comparatively mild one. Overt partisanship in campaign coverage is neither revolutionary nor inconsistent with the traditional role of the press in the American political process.

Indeed, Broder's suggestion may not go far enough to rekindle a vigorous discourse -- or citizen interest -- in presidential campaigns. Thomas C. Leonard, among others, argues that dispassionate, critical reporting and a focus on personalities -- rather than passionate advocacy and partisan debate -- have helped to drive down public participation in elections since the mass voting turnouts of the nineteenth century.[71]

Historically, ample precedent exists for contemporary political reporters to contribute greater intelligence, insight -- and advocacy -- to news coverage of presidential campaigns.

1.In Leo Rosten's study of Washington, D.C., correspondents in 1937, he found that nearly 60 percent of his respondents knew of definite, fixed editorial policies by their newspapers. See Rosten, *The Washington Correspondents* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1937), pp. 220-236. Subsequent studies indicated that correspondents regarded themselves as less partisan. See William Rivers, "The Correspondents After 25 years," *Columbia Journalism Review* 1:1 (Spring 1962), p. 5, and Stephen Hess, *The Washington Reporters* (Washington: Brookings, 1981).

2.Timothy Crouse, *The Boys on the Bus* (New York: Random House, 1973).

3.David Broder, "Political Reporters Challenged in '90 Elections," reprinted in the Portland *Oregonian*, 22 January 1990, p. B1.

4.The news management successes of the Reagan administration are outlined in Mark Hertsgaard's *On Bended Knee: The Press and the Reagan Presidency* (New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1988)

5.Michael Schudson, in *Discovering the News* (New York: Basic Books, 1978), pp. 121-159, analyzes the origins and influence of the idea of objectivity on American journalism.

6.Nelson W. Polsby, *Consequences of Party Reform* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 69. See also F. Christopher Arterton, *Media Politics: The New Strategies of Presidential Campaigns* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1984).

7.See, for example, William David Sloan, "The Early Party Press: The Newspaper Role in American Politics, 1788-1812," *Journalism History* 9 (1982), pp. 18-24.

8.One frequently cited condemnation of the nineteenth century press as the "dark ages" of partisanship comes from the work of Frank Luther Mott, *American Journalism* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1940), p. 167.

9.For a re-examination of the party press in the early nineteenth century, see Gerald J. Baldasty, "The Press and Politics in the Age of Jackson," *Journalism Monographs* 89 (August 1984).

10.George A. Mowry, *The Era of Theodore Roosevelt and the Birth of Modern America, 1900-1912* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958).

11.See, for example, the focus on editors in Willard G. Bleyer, *History of American Journalism* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1927).

12.For varying perspectives on the development of reporters at the turn of the century, see Ted Curtis Smythe, "The Reporter, 1880-1900: Working Conditions and their Influence on the News," *Journalism History* 7:1 (Spring 1980), pp. 1-10, and Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Vintage Books, 1955), pp. 186-214. George Juergens describes the evolving Washington, D.C., press corps in *News from the White House* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

13.Thomas C. Leonard, *The Power of the Press: The Birth of American Political Reporting* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 222-223.

14.Herbert J. Gans, "The Messages Behind the News," *Columbia Journalism Review* (January/February 1979), pp. 40-45.

15.Gerald J. Baldasty and Jeffrey Rutenbeck, "Money, Politics and Newspapers: The Business Environment of Press Partisanship in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Journalism History* 15:2-3 (Summer-Autumn 1989), pp. 60-69.

16.Consider William Randolph Hearst, for example. Hearst was nominally a Democrat -- and served as a Democratic congressman -- but his political campaigns ranged widely. His campaigns for reform are discussed by Roy Everett Littlefield III, *William Randolph Hearst: His Role in American Progressivism* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1980). Hearst's frequent directives constituted "news control" over his newspapers, according to William Quayle Parmenter, "The News Control Explanation of News Making: The Case of William Randolph Hearst, 1920-1940," Ph.D. dissertation, Washington, 1979.

17.Donald A. Ritchie, "'The Loyalty of the Senate': Washington Correspondents in the Progressive Era," *The Historian* 51:4 (August 1989), 574-591.

18.O.O. Stealey, *Twenty Years in the Press Gallery* (New York: Publishers Printing Co., 1906), p. 2.

19.David S. Barry, *Forty Years in Washington* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1924), p. 283.

20.Gilson Gardner to Gifford Pinchot, 25 October 1911, Box 145, Gifford Pinchot Papers, Library of Congress.

21.While E.W. Scripps may have been as influential in turn of the century journalism as Hearst or Joseph Pulitzer, he has only recently been the subject of sustained historical inquiry. A biography by Vance H. Trimble, *The Astonishing Mr. Scripps*, is scheduled for publication in 1990 by the Iowa State University Press. See also Gerald J. Baldasty and Myron K. Jordan, "E.W. Scripps and the Market Business: The Market Niche Strategy of

Competition," paper presented to the Management and Economics Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Minneapolis, Minnesota, August 1990.

22.See Clause Ten, Agreement between E.W. Scripps, Ellen B. Scripps, and George Putnam, 17 August 1902, George Putnam Papers, University of Oregon.

23.Portland News, 27 October 1908; 26 October 1912.

24.E.W. Scripps to W.B. Colver, 3 May 1908, Box 28, E.W. Scripps Papers, Ohio University.

25.List submitted to Senator Robert M. LaFollette by C.F. Mosher, assistant to James G. Scripps, 27 December 1911, Box B70, LaFollette Family Collection, Library of Congress. United Press, because it was marketed to newspapers outside the Scripps organization, remained relatively nonpartisan. See Scripps to R.F. Paine, 1 October 1909, and Scripps to W.B. Colver and Roy W. Howard, 5 November 1909. Both letters are in Box 12, Scripps Papers.

26.Scripps to Pinchot, 27 September 1910, Box 139, Pinchot Papers.

27."Gilson Gardner," Dictionary of American Biography, vol. 7, p. 333.

28.Documentation of Gardner's employment appears in correspondence from Indiana publisher George Browning Lockwood, a former aide to Fairbanks, to Richard Achilles Ballinger, 2 February 1910, Box 8, Ballinger Papers, University of Washington. The article in question, "Republican Candidate for Vice-President," appeared under Shipp's byline in Review of Reviews 30 (November/December, 1904) p. 528.

29.Pinchot to Herbert A. Smith, 9 April 1904, Box 92, Pinchot Papers.

30.Gardner was not the only Washington reporter drawn to Roosevelt. A correspondent for the New York Times, Oscar King Davis, wrote in his autobiography, Released for Publication (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1925), that, on Roosevelt's behalf, he authored magazine articles promoting the candidacy of William Howard Taft in 1908. Davis, however, maintained that he did so despite his newspaper's opposition to Roosevelt.

31.Gilson Gardner, Lusty Scripps: The Life of E.W. Scripps (New York: Vanguard Press, 1932), p. 185. William G. Shepherd, "Our Ears in Washington," Everybody's Magazine, October 1920, p. 71.

32.Scripps at one point considered appointing Gardner to be manager of United Press or to be an editor of one of the chain's newspapers. See Scripps to R.F. Paine, 5 August 1908, Box 11, Scripps Papers.

33.Shortly Taft's inauguration, Scripps wrote Gardner: "I told you so." See Scripps to Gardner, 21 March 1909, Box 11, Scripps Papers. Stories under Gardner's byline in the Portland News included "Roosevelt's Trusted Aides are All Going to Walk the Plank," 27 February 1909; Taft's plan to dismantle Roosevelt's Bureau of Corporations, 3 April 1909; "Reactionary Taft Betrays Roosevelt from the Start," 5 April 1909; "Taft 'Reforms,'" 17 April 1909.

34.See Gardner, "New National Party Looms Up Very Large," San Diego Sun, 19 July 1909, p. 1, and "Robert LaFollette, Senator at Large," San Diego Sun, 7 August 1909, p. 1.

35.For Scripps' enthusiastic account of this meeting, see Scripps to W.H. Porterfield, 7 September 1909, Box 12, Scripps Papers. Scripps to Pinchot, 28 September 1909, Box 12, Scripps Papers. See Gardner stories, "Plundering Interests After Chief Forester," San Diego Sun, 14 December 1909, p. 1, and "Big Conservation War, What It Really Means," San Diego Sun, 5 January 1910, p. 1. After Taft fired Pinchot, Gardner wrote additional supportive stories, including: "Gifford Pinchot's Word to the American People," San Diego Sun, 12 January 1910, p. 1, and "Anything to Have the Public Forget the Pinchot Case," San Diego Sun, 24 January 1910, p. 1.

36.For the background of the Pinchot firing and its effect on the Taft administration, see James Penick Jr., Progressive Politics and Conservation: The Ballinger-Pinchot Affair (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.)

37.Scripps to C.D. Willard, 10 February 1910, Box 12, Scripps Papers.

38.Gardner, Lusty Scripps, pp. 187-188.

39.Although Gardner's stories did not explicitly state that Roosevelt would re-enter public life, they certainly encouraged the idea. Examples include "Don't Bet the Farm that TR's Going to Take the Back Seat," San Diego Sun, 15 March 1910, p. 1; "Roosevelt Ready to Jump into the Fight," Sun Diego Sun, 12 April 1910, p. 1, and "Must be Next President is Cry to Teddy," San Diego Sun, 14 April 1910, p. 1.

40.W.B. Colver to Scripps, 16 April 1910, Box 30, Scripps Papers. Scripps to Colver, 23 April 1910, Box 12, Scripps Papers.

41.Gardner to Scripps, 30 June 1910, Box 30, Scripps Papers. Gardner had anticipated Roosevelt's return with a three-part series for NEA that compared Roosevelt to the royalty of Europe. It appeared in the San Diego Sun on 14 June 1910, 15 June 1910 and 16 June 1910.

42.For an account of Roosevelt's maneuvering during this period, told from Pinchot's viewpoint, see Martin Fausold, Gifford Pinchot: Bull Moose Progressive (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1961), pp. 21-48.

43.Scripps to Gardner, 20 August 1910 and 24 August 1910, Box 13, Scripps Papers. See also Scripps to W.B. Colver, 15 September 1910, Box 13, Scripps Papers.

44.Gardner to Scripps, 19 October 1910, Box 30, Scripps Papers. Before writing Scripps, Gardner wrote a story defending Roosevelt, which appeared in the 15 October 1910 San Diego Sun under the headline: "Gardner Says Roosevelt Tried His Best at Saratoga Convention," p. 9. Scripps to Gardner, 2 November 1910, Box 13, Scripps Papers.

45.Scripps to Ben K. Lindsey, 24 November 1910, Box 13, Scripps Papers. Gardner to Scripps, 25 November 1910 and 10 December 1910, Box 30, Scripps Papers. Scripps to Gardner, 3 December 1910, Box 13, Scripps Papers.

46.Scripps to Pinchot, 7 December 1910, Box 139, Gifford Pinchot Papers. Amos Pinchot, History of the Progressive Party, H.M. Hooker, ed., (Washington Square: New York University Press, 1958) p. 121. Gardner, Lusty Scripps, pp. 188-189.

47.Scripps to William Kent, 5 January 1911, Scripps to LaFollette, 2 January 1911; Scripps to Ben K. Lindsey, 2 January 1911, Box J5, LaFollette Family Collection.

48.Scripps to Gardner, 3 December 1910 and 29 December 1910, Box 13, Scripps Papers. Gardner to Scripps, 19 December 1910 and 30 December 1910, Box 30, Scripps Papers. Gardner to Scripps, 9 January, 1911, Box 31, Scripps Papers. Gardner's presence at strategy sessions is frequently noted in historical studies of the Progressive Party. See, for instance, in George Mowry, Theodore Roosevelt and the Progressive Movement (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1947), pp. 173ff; Helen Maxwell Hooker, ed., "Biographical Introduction," in Amos Pinchot, History of the Progressive Party pp. 25ff, and Martin Fausold, Gifford Pinchot: Bull Moose Progressive (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1961), pp. 57ff.

49. Portland News, 26 January 1911, p. 4. The founding story appeared in the San Diego Sun, 25 January 1911, p.1. Gardner, "Taft Again and Defeat; Progressives and a Chance," San Diego Sun, 9 February, 1911, p. 2, and "Lafollette Picked to Force Taft from Office," San Diego Sun, 14 February 1911, p. 3.

50. For examples of the voluminous campaign correspondence between Gardner and Pinchot, see the records of the Progressive League in Box 145, Pinchot Papers.

51. LaFollette to John Hicks, 10 April 1911, Box B106, LaFollette Family Collection.

52. The campaign schedule and the letter of introduction are found in the 1911 General Correspondence file, Box B106, LaFollette Family Collection.

53. Gardner, "Iowa Will Speak First on Presidency," San Diego Sun, 9 October 1911, p. 9; "South Dakota, at Primaries, will Favor LaFollette as President," San Diego Sun, 13 October 1911, p. 3; "North Dakota's for LaFollette, 10 to 1," San Diego Sun, 17 October 1911, p. 15; "Taft Will Not Receive Republican Nomination," Portland News, 18 October 1911, p. 1; "Taft is Beaten, It's LaFollette," San Diego Sun 18 October 1911, p. 1.

54. Gardner to Pinchot, 25 October 1911, Box 145, Pinchot Papers. John H. Hannan to Medill McCormick, 1 November 1911, Box J112, LaFollette Family Collection.

55. See, for example, Gardner stories in the Portland News that accused Taft of trying to stop muckraking magazines by raising their postal rates, 23 February 1911, p. 1; Taft's political appointee as ambassador to Britain, 8 March 1911, p. 1, and a series of stories on corruption involving coal in public lands in Alaska which was prepared in coordination with the LaFollette campaign, according to correspondence in Box 145, Pinchot Papers. The first article, "Taft Double-Crosses People: Gives Control of Alaska Coal to Morgan-Guggenheims," appeared in the Portland News on 21 April 1911, p. 1.

56. Gardner, "LaFollette Likely to Announce Candidacy Soon," San Diego Sun, 12 June 1911, p. 4; "LaFollette a Candidate for President of United States," Portland News, 17 June 1911, p. 1. John H. Hannan to Pinchot, 18 June 1911, Box 616, Pinchot Papers. Belle Case LaFollette and Fola LaFollette, Robert M. LaFollette (New York: Macmillan, 1953), pp. 338-339.

57. Gardner, "LaFollette Men Join Roosevelt Supporters While Senator 'Bob' Rests," Portland News, 7 February 1912, p. 1.

58.Scripps had complained in February 1911 that Gardner "has always been too close to Roosevelt to be able to see any other person in a strong light." Scripps to Ben K. Lindsey, 2 February 1911, Box 13, Scripps papers. In January 1912, Scripps directed Gardner to show Roosevelt a list of the publisher's presidential preferences. On the list, Roosevelt ranked third, behind LaFollette and Woodrow Wilson. Roosevelt later told Gardner that the letter "did not hurt my feelings a little bit." See Gardner to Roosevelt, 24 January 1912; W.B. Colver to Amos Pinchot, 8 February 1912, and Roosevelt to Gardner, 13 February 12. All are in the Theodore Roosevelt Papers, Library of Congress.

59.Scripps to Gardner, 26 February 1912, Box 14, Scripps Papers.

60.Gardner to Scripps, 7 March 1912, Box 32, Scripps Papers.

61.Scripps to James G. Scripps and others, 11 April 1912, Box 14, Scripps Papers.

62.Fred Greenbaum, Robert Marion LaFollette (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1975), pp. 98-110.

63. For Lafollette's version, see Walter L. Houser to Gardner, undated, Box J112, LaFollette Family Collection. The controversy arose again in the Fall of 1912, when LaFollette repeated the allegations in a serialized version of his autobiography that appeared in American magazine. See Robert L. LaFollette, LaFollette's Autobiography (Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1968 <1913>), pp. 227-284, and Belle Case LaFollette and Fola LaFollette, Robert M. LaFollette, pp. 322-443.

64. Houser's speech in Portland was reported by the Portland News, 29 February 1912, p. 1. The story identified Gardner as "a close friend of Roosevelt and the Washington correspondent of the Scripps-McRae League." It did not mention that the News was part of the League.

65. Gardner to Roosevelt, 19 February and 21 February 1912, Roosevelt Papers. Roosevelt to Gardner, 20 February and 23 February 1912, Roosevelt Papers. See pamphlet, "Houser's Misrepresentation," dated 15 March 1912, in correspondence for 16 March 1912, Roosevelt Papers.

66.Scripps to William Jennings Bryan, 30 March 1912, Box 14, Scripps Papers.

67.See, for example, "TR Not to Attack Wilson," Portland News, 22 July 1912, p. 2.

68.Portland News, 12 November 1912, p. 2.

69. Gardner to Scripps, 27 November 1912, Box 32, Scripps Papers.

70. See Robert E. Burke, "The Scripps West Coast Newspapers and the Election of 1916," presented to the Scripps Symposium, Ohio University, 2 March 1990.

71. Leonard, The Power of the Press, pp. 194, 223.

A QUIET REVOLUTION, 1739-1748:
HOW AMERICA'S FIRST THREE WOMEN NEWSPAPER EDITORS TREATED THE TOPIC OF WOMEN

BY

JULIE HEDGEPETH

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

DEPARTMENT OF JOURNALISM

Presented at the AEJMC 1990 Convention

August 9-12

Minneapolis, Minnesota

A Quiet Revolution, 1739-1748:
How America's First Three Women Newspaper Editors
Treated the Topic of Women

The Feast of St. John the Evangelist did not go well for the Timothy family.

True, the holiday season had been a merry enough one for Charles-town. Ships in the harbor flew their colors and fired their guns. The Masons held a parade and subsequently elected officers for the coming year. Citizens heard an appropriate sermon for the occasion and then held a ball and entertainment in honor of the ladies. The festivities marked the close of December, which even in South-Carolina meant winter was at hand, or nearly so.[1]

It was not a revolutionary scene, and no one at the gala ball suspected Charles-town would soon be involved in one of the most startling developments in the New World. New-York and Philadelphia seemed worlds away to the citizens of Charles-town that night in 1738, but starting that week and for the next decade the three cities would see women take charge in what had been strictly masculine territory.

No one, especially no one in Charles-town, anticipated such a development that night. The people at the St. John festival had other things on their minds. As the year 1739 approached, the revelers in Charles-town were anxious for an end to the smallpox which had lately plagued the provinces.[2] The world was at war, although the colonies rarely saw the war directly; the Charles-town colonists only managed to follow the news of wars around Europe through the local weekly South-Carolina Gazette, which bragged on telling them "the freshest Advices, Foreign and Domestick."[3]

But on the night of the Feast of St. John the Evangelist, no one wanted to think about wars and smallpox and other such unsavory subjects; tonight, the people of Charles-town would dance and delight in the entertainment.

It was a thrilling holiday for Charles-town.

It was not so thrilling for the Lewis Timothy family. By rights it should have been. Lewis was a successful printer. He had six fine children, and his wife Elizabeth was carrying the seventh, due in about a month.[4] Someday, no doubt, his son Peter would take over the printing operation, but the boy was too young at the moment. Late in October Lewis had regretted that his son was so young. Lewis had been sick, and he had to skip publishing the Gazette one week.[5] He looked forward to the day when Peter could become his apprentice.

Unfortunately, Lewis never saw that day. During the week of St. John the Evangelist's feast, Lewis Timothy died in an accident.[6] His death was of course a blow to Charles-town, which scarcely could get along without its weekly Gazette. It was even more of blow to Elizabeth, who realized what she must do. Charles-town needed a newspaper. Elizabeth and her six-almost-seven children needed food on the table. Peter was still a boy. She would have to take over.

Perhaps it was inevitable that Elizabeth Timothy and her fellow female editors in New York and Philadelphia would bring a woman's point of view to their newspapers. By 1746, Elizabeth would be turning over her newspaper to her son, but only after she gave good-natured airing to the inequities between men and women. In Philadelphia, Cornelia Bradford would by 1746 be decrying atrocities against women to whip up passions about a divisive war. In the New York of 1746, Cathrine Zenger would just be starting as editor of her newspaper, and her temper at the mistreatment of women would occasionally flare in her news pages.

Yet Charleston, Philadelphia, and New York most likely never even noticed their news was being printed by women. The ladies editing their papers never intended the cities to see the world strictly from a feminine viewpoint. Elizabeth, Cornelia, and Cathrine never shirked in the obligation established by their husbands to report the world news from troop movements to ship departures, from crop lists to royal births.

Even though none of them set out to be spokeswomen for their sex, the fact remained that they were rare public voices for women in the American colonies. The first three women editors in America did not miss their chance to speak for femininity. Nor did they abuse it.

Little has been written on newspaper statements published about women during the tenure of the first three female newspaper editors in America. Ira Baker has studied the life of Elizabeth Timothy,[7] and Susan Henry has unearthed much valuable information on a number of colonial women printers.[8] Natalie F. Holtzman has uncovered a remarkable stand for women as printed in one of Cathrine Zenger's papers.[9] Clarence Brigham has written about early women editors in America.[10] Madelon Golden Schilpp and Sharon M. Murphy have published work on Elizabeth Timothy's strengths and weaknesses in which they enjoy some of her paper's verses about womanhood.[11] But no study has centered on the voice of women as expressed by America's first three women editors.

Elizabeth Timothy, Cornelia Bradford, and Cathrine Zenger all happened to be editing newspapers in North America in 1746. After Cathrine ended her editorship in 1748, there would not be another female editor in the colonies until 1762. By then times had changed; the colonies were growing toward an opinion of independence. But from 1739 to 1748, America was still securely British. In a continent dominated by masculine leaders, it was extraordinary that three women had the decade-long responsibility to print the news from the crown as well as from ordinary men and women. As women of editorial power, Elizabeth, Cornelia, and Cathrine offered a unique look at womanhood in the colonial era.

Elizabeth Timothy

Elizabeth Timothy was not overconfident as she took over the editorship of her husband's South-Carolina Gazette for its first issue of 1739. "I flatter myself," she begged her readers, "that all those Persons, who, by Subscription or otherwise, assisted my late Husband . . . will be kindly pleased to continue their Favours and good Offices to his poor afflicted Widow and six small Children and another hourly expected."[12] Even though it was not uncommon for the women of Charles-town to hold jobs in the public domain, Elizabeth published the Gazette in the name of her oldest son, Peter.[13] Of course, she was well aware that her position as editor of the Gazette was unique; most other working women did "women's work." During Elizabeth's fledgling days as editor, for instance, Catherine Kay advertised in the Gazette that she could wash Brussels lace and Mecklin lace for people.[14] Mrs. Katharine Wills, newly arrived from London, advertised that she could make coats and cloaks for sale.[15] Sobieskie Straham ran a millinery shop on Tradd Street, where she sold diamond earrings and gold and silver items, as well as women's hats.[16]

Some women were more unconventional. Mrs. Sureau hosted horse racing, complete with betting, on her property.[17] She was a tough businesswomen; at one point she sold several slaves, but only on the condition that the purchaser give good security, have twelve months' credit, and pay interest from the day of the sale.[18] Other women also dickered in property. The Widow Glazer advertised a house to be let and then added in her Gazette advertisement, "The said Widow still continues keeping School as formerly, and soon as the above House is let she will give further Notice where she may be met with."[19]

Elizabeth Timothy's job, of course, was far beyond simply printing the paper and raising a large family. She also printed Bibles, prayer books, and plays,[20] blank bonds, leases, bills of lading, and bills of sale.[21] As printer, she also sold sealing wax, quills, ink powder, and writing paper.[22]

The first few weeks as Charles-town's printer were the worst. Not only was Elizabeth grieving for her husband, but she was anxiously awaiting the birth of their last child. It was a tremendous relief when the baby was born without serious complication in the first week of February. Elizabeth did not miss printing an issue of the Gazette,[23] even though her husband had missed an issue for sickness in October. There were many difficulties in being a woman, and childbirth was one that a woman in charge simply had to ignore, as Elizabeth saw it.

She had hardships of womanhood on her mind as she returned to the Gazette office to print the paper before her newest baby was even a week old. She simply could not pass up a news item brought from London by one of the ships which frequented the Charles-town harbor. Elizabeth included it in her Gazette. A young lady of "great Fortune, Merit and Beauty" had been taken to Croydon Fair by a gentleman. On the way home, they were attacked by a robber. The lady's escort turned out to be a downright coward. "This Heroe," the article scoffed, "upon hearing the Word of Command, leap'd out of the Chaise, and shew'd a light Pair of Heels, leaving his Mistress to the Mercy of the Villain."[24] The villain took all her money, a ring, and all of the poor lady's clothes, except for her under-petticoat. Elizabeth was determined that women could learn from this nasty affair. "It is to be hoped this may serve as a necessary Caution to the Fair Sex, not to trust themselves abroad with any but those whose Courage they have experienced," she printed.[25]

The theme of womanhood at risk in the world of manhood became a recurrent one for Elizabeth; she would repeat it with humor and with decorum off and on until her son took over her press in 1746.

She did not, however, lose sight of her promise to print the freshest news from around the world. Her Gazette was highly concerned with keeping the citizens of Charles-town informed. Her very first issue set the news tone for her publication; she led off with news of an insult committed by Dutch vessels on a Spanish ship in St. Domingo. There were also attempts to end the war in Constantinople, she reported.[26] She never let up in her reports of war and rumors of war across Europe.

She was not squeamish about printing more local conflicts, either. Piracy was a hot issue for maritime Charles-town, and Elizabeth covered piracies. In one case, the schooner named Betty lost its sails to a violent wind, and Spanish pirates fell upon the ship and stripped it of all its necessities. The master and crew were starving by the time their ship limped into the port at Charles-town.[27] The Spanish attempts to stop British ships in American seas were growing more numerous by the week, and the colonies were concerned. Elizabeth accordingly printed a special edition in May of 1739 for the purpose of publicizing a resolution by the House of Lords about the Spanish piracy problem.[28]

Likewise, she frequently printed news of the South-Carolina assembly and other assemblies, along with news of the province and of the city. Her readers certainly knew what was going on in the world in the way of war, royalty, government action, and unusual occurrences.

But Elizabeth had a special interest in women's roles. On April 11, 1743, she tried to incite debate on the issue. There was hardly any news, and so, Elizabeth said, "we shall sometimes entertain our Readers with Extracts from approved Authors. . . . In the mean Time, we shall be obliged to any Gentlemen that will please to communicate to us their sentiments on subjects beneficial to the Province, in order to be publish'd."[29] She hoped gentlemen would comment on the subject at hand, which was the disgusting lack of interest by gentlemen in matrimony. She printed a plea by "Rachel Wishful, Spinster, Deborah Sprightly, Single Woman, Susannah Lovemore, Widow, and 30,000 others," who represented all the virgins, spinsters, single women, and widows of Great-Britain and America.[30]

For the virgins, spinsters, single women, and widows, the April 11 issue was a delicious chance to swing punches at the deadbeat men who insisted on remaining single. The 30,000 ladies and their mythical spokeswomen proclaimed that the most patriotic thing a person could do for the kingdom was to populate it, and although they were ready to do their part toward this lofty goal, they could not. "But thro' the Neglect and Avarice of the Men, who enjoy the sole Priviledge of professing Love, and proposing Matrimony," the women grumbled, the feminine sex was "left wholly unserviceable to their King and Country."[31]

The mythical spokeswomen insisted that unmarried men be barred from "holding any Post of Honour, Trust, or Profit, or sitting in either House of Parliament."[32] The article further proposed that each single man over age 25 be fined a hefty sum. The women asked that they be allowed to court men, "and that the Man declining to marry the Woman so making known her Inclination, unless he be under some prior Engagement, or Inability, shall be deemed a Batchelor convict and be fined 10 Pounds."[33] Incidentally, the ladies said, half the money raised from such a fine would go to reward families with many offspring, and the rest of the funds would "be applied for the Support of those who marry purely for Love, and are unprovided of a sufficient Maintainance."[34]

The only immediate answer to Elizabeth's plea for a reply on the issue was a brief ad by a man complaining that his girlfriend refused his marriage proposal.[35] But the theme would certainly come up again. A few months later E.R. wrote to Elizabeth with "The Ladies Complaint," which she hoped would be published in the Gazette. Elizabeth obliged:

Custom, alas! doth partial prove,
It does not give us equal Measure;
A Pain it is for us to love
But it is to Men a Pleasure.

Men to new Joys and Conquests fly,
And yet no Hazard run,
Whilst we are left, if we deny,
And if we yield, undone.

Then Equal laws let custom find,
And neither Sex oppress;
More Freedom give to Womankind,
Or to Mankind give less.[36]

This time the female sassiness brought a sassy answer. The next issue of the Gazette contained news of a war in Russia, a revolution in Sweden, a sea battle off Cuba, and then a reply to E.R.'s poem. "Incog.," who promised the publisher he was "Your constant reader," had dashed off a reply to E.R. Elizabeth printed it:

Dear Miss, of Custom you complain;
It seems to me you languish,
For some dear, simple, homely Swain,
To ease you of some Anguish.
. . . .
If so, dear Miss, by Ogling shew,
The Wishes of your Heart;
Your Dear will grant the same to you,
Or act a Shameful Part.

The healing Balm then Miss you'll find,
From whence you'll not so vex,
Nor ever more prove so unkind,
As you have to my sex.[37]

The battle flared again in November. By now it had taken a turn toward the bitter, but Elizabeth was not averse to giving space to the opinion. News of the general assembly and the hostilities with Spain still dominated the Gazette, and one more hostility would simply broaden the public's horizons on issues closer to home. Elizabeth printed a verse on "Women born to be controul'd:"

How wretched is a woman's Fate,
No happy change her Fortune knows,
Subject to Man in every state.
How can she then be free from woes?

In Youth a Father's stern Command,
And jealous Eyes controul her will;
A lordly Brother watchful stands,
To keep her closer Captive still.

The tyrant Husband next appears,
With awful and contracted Brow;
No more a Lover's form he wears,
Her Slave's become her Sov'reign now.[38]

While she had not been overly successful sparking a battle over the question of matrimony with the call for bachelors to be fined, Elizabeth was successful at starting quarrels in verse. Immediately following the lady's verse was an answer by a gentleman:

How happy is a Woman's fate,
Free from Care, and free from Woe,
Secure of Man is ev'ry state,
Her Guardian-God below!
. . . .

'Tis Man's to labour, toil, and sweat,
And all his Care employ,
Honour, or Wealth, or Pow'r to get;
'Tis Woman's to enjoy.[39]

While Elizabeth enjoyed diverting attention to the opinions of women on their situation, she knew that many women had no time for such frivolity as verse and wit. She was personally concerned with the difficulties women faced, and she earnestly sought to print their stories to give them credit for what they had done or were compelled to do. At one point she ran a homily in praise of agriculture, but particularly in praise of the ordinary farm woman. "And the Ladies must excuse my Want of Taste or Manners," Elizabeth printed, "in thinking the clean, tuck'd up nimble Lass makes a more pleasing Figure, than the Duchess who sweeps half the Mall with her enormous Petticoat."[40] The article went on to praise the industrious housewife with a "half a Score [of] lusty Children," describing the housewife as far more amiable "than the finest she, who has made two millions of insipid Visits and propagated Tittle-tattle from one End of the Town to the other."[41]

Elizabeth occasionally spoke eloquently of specific women. She told of a loyal woman who committed suicide when her only sister died.[42] Another time she pitied a nurse who perished in a hurricane while saving a sucking child.[43] Elizabeth was highly impressed with the trials and achievements and sacrifices of the everyday woman, and she made sure these found their way into her Gazette. It was not remarkable that she felt that way, for after all, she was one of them. She, too, had not been born into royalty or aristocracy; she was just a mother of seven called to take over the leadership of Charles-town's newspaper.

Cornelia Bradford

While Elizabeth Timothy was challenging Charles-town to consider the situations of women, Cornelia Bradford was facing challenges of her own in Philadelphia. Near the end of November, 1742, Andrew Bradford died.[44] In grief following the passing of her husband, Cornelia could not at once bring herself to go to his American Weekly Mercury newspaper office and decide what to do.

It didn't take her long to decide. Andrew's loyalties had been to Philadelphia, and so would Cornelia's. He had founded the Mercury,[45] and by now it had a distinct "look" about it, featuring a complicated and artful woodcut for a masthead, giving it something of an established flavor. The Mercury must go on. Besides, Cornelia needed to make a living, and Philadelphia needed its Mercury. She felt bad about missing the issue after Andrew's death. She made up for it by running a six-page issue, bigger than the usual four pages, to cram in all the news that Philadelphians had missed from mid-November to December 2. She begged readers' forgiveness. "As Mr. Andrew Bradford departed this Life on the 24th of November last," she wrote, "I hope those who were pleased to be Customers for the American Weekly Mercury . . . will excuse the Omission of last Weeks Paper at the usual time."[46] She promised that the paper would be carefully produced in the future.[47]

Cornelia was a little worried about her ability to attract customers. Especially after her husband's death and after the Mercury missed a week, people would wonder if the Bradford printing operation were still in business. She let people know in her first issue that the Bradford press was still active. "And all Persons who have any Printing Work to do, or have Occasion for Stationary Ware," she wrote, "shall be thankfully serv'd at the lowest Prices."[48]

As editor, Cornelia found the world at war. Her newspaper bulged with accounts of battles, losses, gains, strategy, troop movements, and so on across Europe. Of particular concern was a rebellion in Scotland. A poet in an early 1746 issue lamented the "doubtful Times . . . dire confusion and rebellious war" as a "false Pretender" tried to claim the throne.[49] People tended to see the war in catastrophic terms. "Whereas, if this Nation be thrown into a general Rebellion, or Civil War, the whole common Cause of Europe, and particularly the Protestant Cause, will be irretrievably lost," Cornelia printed.[50] The Pretender to the throne, James Stuart,[51] happened to be Catholic, which Cornelia felt greatly threatened all Protestants in the British Isles and Britain's colonies, including Pennsylvania. The threat to the Protestant cause appeared to double when the Pretender's son, the Young Pretender Charles, declared he had succeeded his father and now ruled Britain.[52] Cornelia was not swayed by the announcement and continued to call Charles a pretender, not a king.

She gave thorough attention to all sorts of details about the war. She printed, for instance, that soldiers had to be at least five feet, five inches tall to serve in Scotland.[53] She also published a chart to whip up support:

King George	The Pretender
Liberty & propety [*sic*]	Slavery . . . & Beggary
with the	A Popish Arbitrary Power
Free exercise of our	Sent from Rome . . . .
Religion	with Persecution,
under a Protestant King	Idolatry, Massacres, and
and Parliament	a bloody Inquisition[54]

There was absolutely no doubt in Cornelia's mind of the dangers of this rebellion, especially if King George were to lose the throne. She harked back to "Popish and bloody Queen Mary" in history to remind her readers of the horrors of nonProtestant rule. The antiPapist rhetoric took on uglier tones when the article went on to call the Catholic church in Rome "the great Whore, and the Mother of all Abominations; and the Pope is that Antichrist."[55]

Although war was a man's game, Cornelia was convinced that it had great consequences for women. While she printed standard news of the war in great detail, she did not merely cover victories and defeats. The *Mercury* showed a grimmer, less glorified side of war: how it affected the innocent. Without slanting the war news toward women, Cornelia did not miss the chance to show the implications of war for both sexes. In the middle of reports of troop movements, casualties, and battles, she would occasionally point out women's roles in war.

She printed a story from Kendal, England, about a woman carrying provisions under her hoop skirt to a castle. Unfortunately for her, the enemy found her out. They brought her to the market cross of the town, where she was "stripped naked, and expose'd, after which they put her to death in a cruel manner."[56] Another account told of many "detestable" and "shocking" actions of highland troops. "Not content with stripping several Families of all their valuable Effects, they scrupled not to make free with the Persons of several young Ladies," the *Mercury* disapproved, adding that one gentleman "had the misery to see his three Daughters treated in such a manner that he could not bear to relate it."[57] Cornelia pleaded, "What does not this wicked Crew deserve! How can these plundering shabby Banditti be sufficiently punished?"[58]

She continued to shake her head at broad effects of the war. Country families in Britain were fleeing to walled cities to escape the troops, while city families were fleeing in confusion to the countryside.[59] Many wives and families were sent away for safekeeping.[60] During one battle, she reported, "about 150 Women bore arms, and behaved in a most surprizing Manner."[61]

Cornelia was thrilled to discover a 1706 account of a female victim of the Inquisition. It surely would provoke the necessary outrage at the enemy. The story, she promised, would "show what Detestation all true Protestants ought to have of the Popish Religion."[62] The article told of Elizabeth Vasconcellos, an Englishwoman living on the island of Madeira. While her husband was away, she fell seriously ill, and the parish priest came to her house and gave her the Sacrament. Of course, Cornelia told her readers, Mrs. Vasconcellos was so delirious that she remembered nothing of it. However, when she recovered, she was told she had to confirm in the "Romish Church," having had the Sacrament and changed her religion.[63]

When Mrs. Vasconcellos refused, she was thrown in jail for seven months. She was stripped, body-searched, and commanded to worship a crucifix. When she refused, she was punished. Cornelia didn't spare her readers any details of Mrs. Vasconcellos' humiliation. "If her Resolution was to burn rather than profess the Romish Religion," Cornelia printed, "they would give her a Trial of it before hand."[64] Mrs. Vasconcellos was bound and forced to sit in a chair. "Her left Foot was made bare, and an Iron slipper red-hot being immediately brought in, her foot was fasten'd into it, which continued on, burning to the Bone," the Mercury recounted.[65] Later she was whipped "till her Back was all over torn."[66] Finally Mrs. Vasconcellos signed a paper (she never read it) and was set free.[67]

Cornelia made sure her readers knew how depraved the Popish forces were by telling how they treated their own women. She printed an article about a Scottish knight whose lady prevailed on him to join the Pretender's rebel armies. She herself decided to visit the Young Pretender. Unfortunately for the lady, she was met by rebels, who "seize'd upon the Lady, pull'd her out of the Coach, and robb'd, ravish'd, and abuse'd her in a manner too shocking to relate," Cornelia said, leaving the details to her readers' imaginations.[68] Any man foolish enough to be duped into serving the Pretender was no hero, and Cornelia didn't hesitate to point out such a sorry specimen of masculinity. "Her Husband, as soon as he heard of it, without waiting to seek Satisfaction for so gross an Insult on his Honour, slink'd off from the Rebels and return'd home," she printed.[69]

Cornelia sought to discredit the Young Pretender through his personal relationships with women as well. Ladies travelled with the man, as he was supposedly faint and sick. Cornelia did not believe that for a minute. She reported the story of a woman who threw herself at the Pretender, and "he took her in his Arms, and retir'd with her into his Tent, and were there some Time alone, the rest . . . we are to guess."[70]

That wasn't the only time Cornelia used dubious relationships with women to discredit men. On another occasion, a preacher identified as Rev. W----d had been in Philadelphia.[71] He was preaching against the Church of England, and some people thought he was dangerous. Cornelia reported he wanted to make his own prayers and dispense with ritual. She informed her readers that he had been turned out of the conventional church and had taken to the fields, where he was "attended by Numbers of Women and silly People."[72] In fact, the Mercury said, Rev. W----d's livelihood depended on his followers, who seemed to consist of wives and servants who were "softened" by his sermons and thought nothing of taking their husband's or master's money to make presents to the reverend. He had, the article complained, "occasioned Varience between Husband and Wife, Friends and Relations."[73] Similarly, a questionable operator of an orphan house in Georgia took money supposedly for orphans and instead spent the funds on his sister and wife, although Cornelia did print that some people said the money was indeed spent on the orphans.[74]

Cornelia's last surviving Mercury was published on May 22, 1746. Characteristically, it offered the latest news of war. Cornelia reported updates on the Scottish fighting, on war in Belgium, and on disturbing Indian action against whites in the colonies, which had grown more and more frequent of late. She offered a travelogue of Brussels so that her readers would understand the city which had recently been under attack by the French.[75]

It was an interesting tactic which Cornelia used to publicize war. She was fascinated by the horrors innocent people experienced or could experience under an oppressive ruler. She never shied away from numerous standard reports of war movements, but surely Philadelphia was aware, by 1746, of the nonmilitary cost of war.

Cathrine Zenger

In the late summer of 1746, Cathrine Zenger succeeded her husband John Peter Zenger as publisher of The New-York Weekly Journal. Her late husband had been known as the defendant in an early freedom-of-the-press trial;[76] the tradition of newspaper publishing was firm in the Zenger family. Cathrine, nevertheless, was somewhat nervous and took the opportunity to announce in her first issue that she intended to continue publishing the paper, and she hoped that "the Gentlemen who have been the deceased's kind Benefactors will still continue to be such in encouraging the said Paper as before."[77] Momentarily, she felt obliged to list her printing business under the name of John Zenger, Junr.,[78] but by the time she printed her next issue, she had dropped the masculine front and noted that the Widow Catharine Zenger was a local printer of almanacs and chronicles of the ongoing war.[79] Although she spelled her name with a middle "a" in her ads, she spelled it without the middle "a" in her publisher's line at the end of each Journal.

The Journal promised its readers "the freshest Advices, Foreign and Domestick,"[80] and it delivered on that promise. The Journal under Cathrine was cosmopolitan, concerned with information from such varied places as Antigua, Boston, the Hague, Copenhagen, New York, London, and Madeira. In her first issue, Cathrine printed the House of Lords' declaration that it would be unwise for Britain to participate in a war in Flanders, fretting that the nation was already "grievously burden'd with Debts and Taxes" and warning that a war would "destroy the publick Credit."[81] When it came to delivering the promised "Advices," Cathrine could not help but remember the position and abilities of her late husband. Borrowing on his spirit, she decried censorship of newspapers; she lashed out against schemes of the French government to control what its people knew about the world.[82]

The Journal printed a wide array of news stories, even gory ones. Cathrine published tales of executions in all their bloody detail, telling how the executioner removed and burned bowels and hearts of the executed.[83] In another Journal story, a young lady watching the execution of her lover cried out, "My Dear, I follow thee!--I follow thee!--Lord Jesus, receive both our Souls together!" and died immediately.[84]

Cathrine told of bizarre things which heralded a dazzling future. A Mrs.

Wilson, for instance, was demonstrating a wonderful electricity machine. The machine had been exhibited in Europe, making electricity all the rage. In this particular experiment, electric fire darted between participants in the experiment and was sure to cure ailments, the Journal marveled.[85]

Other news items were immediately threatening, and Cathrine made sure they were printed. One day the news that a Spanish privateer sloop was lurking off the coast arrived so late that Cathrine typeset the news sideways in the margin.[86]

The majority of stories in the Journal centered on worldwide news and reports from the colonies, but Cathrine from time to time exploded with indignation about the treatment of women. She touted the story of Polly Baker as "remarkable" when she printed it on Aug. 3, 1747. Miss Baker had been taken to court in Connecticut for having her fifth bastard child, Cathrine explained.[87] Miss Baker's speech was forthright and touching. She noted she had no money for a lawyer and would simply have to speak for herself. "I take the Liberty to say that I think this Law . . . is both unreasonable in itself, and particularly severe with regard to me who have always lived an inoffensive Live [sic]," she complained. "I cannot conceive (may it please your Honours) what the Nature of my Offence is. I have brought five fine Children into the World, at the Risque of my life."[88]

Miss Baker stated firmly that the king's new country was surely in want of people, and she had done her part. Cathrine Zenger's more conservative readers might have been horrified at such an attitude had Miss Baker not been so eloquent at evoking sympathy. She reported to the judges that she would readily marry, and in fact had agreed to marry a man once "when I was a Virgin; but too easily confiding in the Person's Sincerity that made [the proposal], I unhappily lost my own Honor, by trusting to his, for he got me with Child and then forsook me."[89] To make matters worse, this man was none other than a judge. Miss Baker had hoped he would hear her case, but he was not assigned to it. She was angry. "Take into your wise Consideration the great and growing Number of Batchelors in the Country, many of whom [because] of Fear of the Expences of a Family, have never sincerely and honourably courted a Woman in their lives," she sputtered. "By their Manner of Living, [they] leave unproduced (which is little better than Murder) Hundreds of their Posterity to the Thousandth Generation. Is this not a greater Offence against the Public Good than mine?"[90] She noted for Cathrine's readers that there was an inherent unfairness in the fact that women had to bear and raise children, while uncommitted fathers need not be hindered by families.[91]

Miss Baker made her case so well that, Cathrine was pleased to report, one of her judges married her the next day.[92]

Polly Baker's plea against the indignations suffered by females because of their sex was not the only one which found its way into the Journal. Cathrine was livid at the story of a German immigrant in Lancaster County who decided that "one daughter was sufficient for him to bring up, seeing Girls are not commonly so able to labour as Boys are."[93] Cathrine printed in thorough detail the subsequent attempts of Nicholas Weyrick to kill his baby daughter. He often burned the baby with a pipe or crammed her mouth full of tobacco. He tried to freeze her to death and attempted to suffocate her by blowing tobacco smoke in her mouth. When he finally succeeded in killing the child after four months of attempts, he was put in jail.[94]

Cathrine exploded at the nightmarish abuse of the little girl. She added indignantly in a note following the story, "The Jury, to the Surprize of all who attended the Trial, or were any way acquainted with the Case, brought in their Verdict MANSLAUGHTER?"[95] She could not believe the verdict. "He was accordingly punished by burning in the Hand," she printed.[96]

With some amusement, Cathrine also told of a man who sold his wife to another man. The woman was unhappy with the arrangement and returned home. By then, her original husband was missing her, too, and he "received her with Caresses, looking on her return as a great compliment paid to him, and they are like to live happily together for the future," Cathrine printed.[97] She was not indignant about the affair, although it was certainly an oddity.

Cathrine was interested in soothing the indignities suffered by women. In the spirit of righting a wrong against women, she gave space to a man identified as Kursonus, who wrote a long verse to ladies offended by remarks he had made in another newspaper. He apparently had offered advice about love, and Cathrine deemed his apology and correction important enough to run, even though the Journal had not carried the original piece.[98] Kursonus still couldn't resist giving ladies a little advice:

> Let not Ambition fire your Mind,
> The haughty Maid's oft ill requited,
> To fashionable Fools inclin'd,
> Who leaves the real Lover slighted.[99]

But there was far more going on in the world than Kursonus' apology for his misdeeds. Cathrine had a thorough and ongoing interest in the progress of several wars. She was fond of printing detailed tables which furnished such information as the numbers of men and horses killed and injured in battle[100] and numbers of soldiers called by the king.[101] Ultimately she was able to print the hope of peace. An armistice was drawn up between the warring English and French in 1748.[102]

For Cathrine, the war was no far-off event; as the 1740s ripened toward the 1750s, the war began to hit closer to home. Cathrine was concerned about innocent victims of the war. A number of citizens had been taken prisoner in the area and had been held captive in Canada by the French. Many had been held since May of 1745 before they were finally released under a flag of truce in August of 1747. Cathrine ran long lists of the men and women who were returning home. She was delighted to list them as homebound after as many as two years in jail. She worried that a few prisoners remained in Canada in hospitals, and that a few had died there.[103]

Cathrine's temper did not surface frequently, but it did appear when she was personally under attack. Apparently some "Evil minded Persons," as she described them, began spreading a rumor that she had entirely dropped the printing business.[104] That report, she said, "is Notoriously False," and she assured the public she was still in business.[105]

Cathrine finally did pass The New-York Weekly Journal to John Zenger, Jr., in December of 1748. She had lived up to her promise to provide her readers with the freshest news, but she also could not suppress her feelings from time to time about the victimization of women. She did not forget the news, but occasionally she deemed women's roles as news and did not miss the chance to print it.

Conclusion

Cathrine Zenger fit into the pattern of Elizabeth Timothy and Cornelia Bradford. As America's first three female newspaper editors, they each held great power to rewrite the definition of news, and yet they did not abuse that power. They reported the news in the manner established by their husbands.

But they were women, and their feminine outlook came into print often enough to perhaps leave some impression on the public. Elizabeth sought a point-counterpoint between women and men. Cathrine let her temper show once in awhile when females suffered discrimination. Cornelia took up the banner of innocent female victims to push her point of view.

Since Elizabeth Timothy, Cornelia Bradford, and Cathrine Zenger had the power to select and print the news for 1740s Americans, their views of women as expressed in their work told a vivid tale of femininity in the era. They published honestly about the hardships women faced, giving their readers a clear view of womanhood in a society which tended to give little real public voice to women.

But their achievement was far more than a picture of femininity. Their editorial treatment of women showed something about their character as editors. How they handled the topic of women, printing it secondarily to other news although it obviously interested each of them, showed editorial restraint. The press would not always follow the ladies' opinion that it was best to report all the news and to minimize the editor's personality. That theme would evolve to be important in journalism in centuries to come, but not right away. The young press of America still had heavily partisan years to go through before it came to agree that the "freshest Advices, Foreign and Domestick" involved an array of topics and ideas which certainly reflected the editor but were not restricted to her . . . or him.

The potentially revolutionary introduction of women into the male world of American newspaper editing was so characterized by restraint that is was not, then, a revolution at all. And given the constraints normally placed on women, that restraint by America's first three female editors was an interpretation of editorial power which was indeed remarkable.

NOTES

[1] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 28 December 1738, 2.

[2] The smallpox theme was common in the second half of 1738; see for instance The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 31 August 1738, 1-2.

[3] The slogan appeared on each edition of the Gazette; see for instance The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 4 January 1739, 1.

[4] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 8 February 1739, 4.

[5] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 2 November 1738, 1. Lewis Timothy's name was originally spelled "Timothée," but he anglicized it to "Timothy."

[6] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 4 January 1739, 3.

[7] Ira Baker, "Elizabeth Timothy: America's First Woman Editor," Journalism Quarterly 54 (1977): 280-285.

[8] Susan Henry has authored many works on colonial women printers. Among those is "Colonial Woman Printer as Prototype: Toward a Model for the Study of Minorities," Journalism History 3 (1976): 20-24.

[9] Natalie F. Holtzman, ed., "The Remarkable Speech of Miss Polly Baker," Journalism History 1 (1974-1975): 116.

[10] Clarence S. Brigham, Journals and Journeymen (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950).

[11] Madelon Golden Schilpp and Sharon M. Murphy, Great Women of the Press (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983).

[12] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 4 January 1739, 3.

[13] Ibid., p. 4.

[14] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 19 May 1739, 2.

[15] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 29 March 1739, 3.

[16] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 1 March 1739, mistakenly dated as 29 February 1739, 3.

[17] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 24 March 1739, 3.

[18] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 29 March 1739, 4.

[19] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 12 May 1739, 4.

[20] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 29 March 1739, 3.

[21] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 30 June 1739, 2.

[22] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 29 March 1739, 3.

[23] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 8 February 1739, 4.

[24] Ibid., p. 2

[25] Ibid.

[26] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 4 January 1739, 1-2.

[27] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 8 February 1739, 2.

[28] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), undated supplement following 3 May 1739.

[29] The South-Caroline Gazette (Charleston), 11 April 1743, 1.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid., pp. 1-2.

[34] Ibid. p. 2.

[35] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 2 May 1743, 3.

[36] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 15 August 1743, 3.

[37] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 22 August 1743, 3.

[38] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 21 November 1743, 2.

[39] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 21 November 1743, 2-3.

[40] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 5 April 1739, 1.

[41] Ibid.

[42] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 23 June 1739, 1-2.

[43] The South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston), 19 April 1739, 2.

[44] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 2 December 1742, 6.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid.

[49] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 15 January 1746, 2.

[50] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 11 February 1746, 1.

[51] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 21 January, 1746, 1, called the elder Pretender "James." His full name is given as "James Stuart" in Esmé Wingfield-Stratford, The History of British Civilization (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1933), 643.

[52] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 21 January, 1746, 1.

[53] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 18 February 1746, 3.

[54] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 25 February 1746, 2.

[55] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 8 May 1746, 1.

[56] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 8 January 1746, 3.

[57] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 3 April 1746, 2.

[58] Ibid.

[59] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 11 March 1746, 2.

[60] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 27 March 1746, 2.

[61] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 18 March 1746, 2.

[62] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 10 April 1746, 1.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Ibid.

[68] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 18 February 1746, 3.

[69] Ibid.

[70] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 27 March 1746, 2.

[71] Anna Janney DeArmond identifies Rev. W----d as George Whitefield in Andrew Bradford: Colonial Journalist (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1949), 30.

[72] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 29 January 1746, 1-2.

[73] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 4 February 1746, 1-2.

[74] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 27 March 1746, 1.

[75] The American Weekly Mercury (Philadelphia), 22 May 1746, 1-3.

[76] Benson J. Lossing, "Freedom of the Press Vindicated," Harper's New Monthly Magazine 57 (July 1878): 293-298.

[77] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 1 September 1746, 4.

[78] Ibid.

[79] The dates of the next several issues of the Journal were never printed in the newspapers. This citation is from The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), first surviving issue after 1 September 1746, 4.

[80] The slogan appeared on each edition of the Journal; see for instance The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 1 September 1746, 1.

[81] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 1 September 1746, 1.

[82] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), undated issue; it is the fourth surviving issue after 1 September 1746, 1.

[83] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), undated issue; it is the second surviving issue after 1 September 1746, 2.

[84] Ibid.

[85] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 9 May 1748, 4.

[86] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 4 April 1748, 3.

[87] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 3 August 1747, 1.

[88] Ibid.

[89] Ibid.

[90] Ibid., pp. 1, 4.

[91] Ibid., p. 4.

[92] Ibid., p. 1.

[93] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 15 August 1748, 2.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Ibid.

[96] Ibid.

[97] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 6 July 1747, 2.

[98] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 12 October 1747, 4.

[99] Ibid.

[100] Tables appeared frequently. One example was printed in The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), undated issue; it is the fifth surviving issue after September 1, 1746, 2.

[101] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 6 July 1747, 2.

[102] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 15 August 1748, 1.

[103] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 31 August, 1747.

[104] The New-York Weekly Journal (New York), 14 March, 1748, 3.

[105] Ibid.

History Division

"A Quiet Revolution, 1739-1748: How America's First Three Women Newspaper Editors Treated the Topic of Women"

By Julie Hedgepeth
University of Alabama
College of Communication
Journalism Department
Box 870172
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0172
phone 205-348-7155

Abstract:

The first three female newspaper editors in America had a golden opportunity to rewrite the definition of news along feminine lines. They lived in the 1740s, which were plagued by piracy, wars, and other primarily male pursuits. These women editors reported such news faithfully, while also reporting news which was primarily of interest to women. Elizabeth Timothy was concerned with the dangers, to women, of dating, and she printed debates on women's roles. Cornelia Bradford used innocent female victims as subjects in news stories to lash out against an ongoing war. Cathrine Zenger spoke energetically about single motherhood and abuse of female children. But while these three women editors obviously had an interest in women's issues, they did not allow women's news to dominate their newspapers. The majority of their news was of wars, royal decrees, legislative speeches, and so on. They did not emphasize their feminine interests.

PARTISANSHIP AS SOCIAL PRACTICE:
SEATTLE AND THE *CIVIL SERVICE AGE*, 1915-1919

James F. Hamilton

Ph.D. program
School of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
(319) 335-5821

Presented to the History Division, 1990 AEJMC National Convention, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

PARTISANSHIP AS SOCIAL PRACTICE:
SEATTLE AND THE CIVIL SERVICE AGE, 1915-1919

When reading journalism history, one too often gets the impression that journalistic forms are as discrete as the eras that supposedly mark their life-spans. Although recent journalism histories acknowledge the gradual change in form over the years, few have pointed out the persistence of earlier forms, and how they are appropriated in different times and places for purposes quite different as well.

The goal of this paper is to trace such a persistence, to see how the use of an earlier form differed when appearing in a time and place far different from when it first arose. This paper will explore the appropriation of the 19th-Century tradition of partisanship by the Civil Service Age, a 20th-Century publication. The significance of this study is that it documents not only the life and demise of one such publication, it also depicts how John Locke's classical libertarian ideas about language were used for purposes quite different than those originally intended.

The paper begins by presenting background on partisanship, Locke and his theory of language, and what is meant in this paper by "social practice." Then, after a statement of the substantive questions to be addressed in this paper, a narrative history of the Civil Service Age is presented. It outlines the forces that shaped the Age (general social pressures, economic pressures, and editors' pressures), as well as provides some evidence of the initial success of the resulting editorial stance.

The historical narrative concludes with a discussion of changes in editorial stance, first from opposition to the newly formed civil service union to a grudging acceptance, then from acceptance to a sudden and virulent opposition. The paper ends with a discussion and interpretation that deals with the history of the Civil Service Age as it relates to the social practice of partisanship and to journalism history.

I. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND: PARTISANSHIP AS SOCIAL PRACTICE

During its dominant phase (roughly 1790s-1840s), the partisan press in America presented in its pages vigorous and often very heated debates of political issues. The rationale for such a press was supplied by libertarian theory: that truth is discovered through the free and open debate between various viewpoints in a public marketplace of ideas. It was this marketplace of ideas that libertarian theory posited as the ideal and that the partisan press sought to create.[1]

Many thinkers contributed to the loose body of philosophy that constituted classical liberalism. John Locke (1632-1704), one of the most prominent, not only contributed notions about the nature of people in society, he also contributed a theory of language and meaning. Locke's treatise An Essay Concerning Human Understanding contains a lengthy discussion of the nature of language, and the process by which people come to share understandings.[2] Two implications of his ideas had direct bearing on the success of the marketplace of ideas.

The first implication had to do with the disorder that willful deception would cause in such a system: An a priori condition for a free and open exchange in the marketplace of ideas was the public statement of one's true and honest allegiances and beliefs.

The second had to do with the fidelity with which language conveyed meaning. Locke's notion of language can be called a "commodity" view, and is based on classical economic thinking. For Locke, language was a neutral vehicle that carried meaning from writers to readers. When the people involved are not purposively trying to deceive each other, the meaning that gets to the receiver is exactly what the sender sent.[3]

These ideas did not die out as the years wore on. The tenets of classical liberalism and the vision of the marketplace of ideas--first given shape by a partisan press that operated 150 years ago in a barely post-agrarian nation--are an oft-used justification for the activities of today's corporate mass-media conglomerates. In addition to the political rationale of classical liberalism, theories of language first articulated by Locke remain with us as well.

Despite this persistence, journalism historians have paid surprisingly little attention to the degree to which these 18th Century theories and 19th Century practices remain with us today--most strikingly, how the tradition of partisanship (seen in such ways as pre-election-day recommendations that appear in nearly every newspaper) persists today, although often in different forms and for difference purposes that in earlier times.

Studies of partisanship in the time in which it was a dominant form contribute a valuable understanding of the complex web of political and business relationships, as well as how the organizational structure contributed to its role in its day.[4] Unfortunately, they spend comparatively less time on the philosophical bases upon which the writing of partisan news--the tradition and practice of partisanship--rested. As a result, the further one moves from the specific time and place that these studies address, the less useful they become for understanding how these early practices and traditions manifest themselves in later years.

A way to understand more fully how partisanship has manifested itself in later years and to what purpose it is used is to view it as not exclusively an outcome of a particular funding system (although how a publication is funded is important), nor as a unique age of Partisan Journalism, be it dark or golden (although it certainly is significant in that time).[5] Partisanship can also be seen as a social practice:

social, in that it is carried out in the public sphere using a social means of interaction (language); a practice, in that it is something people do.

By studying language found in newspapers ("put there" by journalists and those who controlled access to the pages), we can begin to document the development and reappearance of journalistic forms, then understand this development in terms of changing ideas about language as well as changing material conditions.[6] This study, which investigates a single case of the appropriation of an earlier form, provides us with an understanding of the historical development of journalism as social practice, as well as some idea of its role the creation, change, or maintenance of the social order.

To fully deal with the ideas of Locke, their relationship to partisanship, and their re-emergence in later eras is beyond the scope of this paper. However, what is in reach is an exploration of how a particular publication in the early 20th Century made use of the practice and tradition of partisanship, but for purposes quite contrary to those in earlier eras.

II. THE SUBSTANTIVE QUESTIONS ADDRESSED IN THIS STUDY

The publication to be examined in this study is a monthly magazine titled the Civil Service Age, which was published in Seattle from 1915 through 1919.[7] Attention will be focused on its explicitly partisan nature. In particular, the focus will be on two areas, both of which are discussed below: 1) the atypical relationship between content and source of financing, and 2) an apparent and drastic change in its editorial stance.

The relationship between content and source of funding is typically characterized by matching a source of funding to a type of publication. For example, partisan publications are primarily financed by a certain group or groups in order to promote their particular interests. By contrast, commercial publications are primarily financed by revenue from subscriptions and advertising sales in order to attract an ever-expanding audience and become a successful business.

What makes the Civil Service Age useful for addressing questions about relationships between content and source of financing is how it confounds this oft-used typology. It explicitly billed itself as a partisan publication that promoted the welfare and interests of civil service employees in Seattle, but it depended exclusively on commercial sources of revenue. In terms of the ideal types listed above, it "mismatches" content (partisan) with source of funding (subscriptions and advertising) and, for this reason, represents a deviation that is worthy of study.[8]

In addition to the question about content and funding, the drastic change in editorial stance of the Civil Service Age deserves attention. Through most of its short four-year life, the Age appeared to stridently promote the interests of civil service employees; however, in its final issue, it suddenly and completely reversed its stand and condemned city employees and their aims. When viewed in terms of the apparent contradiction between content (partisan) and source of financing (commercial), this change in editorial stance provides an opportunity to ask questions about the myriad of relationships between content, financing, producers, and readership--all within a specific historical context.

In short, the specific questions to be addressed in this study are: Was the Civil Service Age aligned with any identifiable causes or groups? If so, what were they, and for what reasons was the Age aligned with them? And, lastly, how did these affiliations change through the term of the Age's publication, and how might these changes be explained?

III. A HISTORY OF THE CIVIL SERVICE AGE

Many forces combined to shape the Civil Service Age. Three primary ones are discussed below: general social pressures, economic pressures, and editors' pressures.

General social pressures: Demand for reform

During the 1910s, city government in Seattle was under much criticism for being too lenient morally and not thrifty enough financially. This situation was not unique to Seattle; it was a local manifestation of the general program championed by Progressives during the early 1900's.[9]

During this time, reform-minded organizations formed with the purpose of turning Seattle into an efficient and moral city.[10] Of the many groups, the Municipal League was most notable because it spearheaded the effort toward reform; its proposed solution to minimizing graft and vice in government was to simply minimize the size of government.[11] Such a solution also "interested many businessmen otherwise opposed to reform," wrote a historian of the period, "for it offered the possibility of lower tax rates" because less tax money would need to be collected from them to finance this "leaner" government.[12]

A natural place at which to cut city government was its payroll, and it is with the proposal of this "solution" that city employees came into the picture. For this solution naturally conflicted with city employees' interests not only of keeping their jobs, but of improving their pay and working conditions.

To counter the Municipal League and like-minded reform groups, civil service employees ranging from department heads to day laborers formed a loose coalition that called itself the "Civil Service League." The League became the body that represented the city employees' interests in disputes and negotiations with the city and other reform groups.[13]

In addition to the formation of the League, a monthly magazine appeared in March 1915 that promoted the interests of the city employees. It was titled the Civil Service News (becoming the Civil Service Age starting with the August 1915 issue), and was founded by Henry W. Powell and Arthur E. Borderud,[14] and edited by Roscoe Brown, all of Seattle.[15]

Economic pressures: Attracting readers and revenue

The Civil Service Age was not funded by donations or dues, but by the sales of subscriptions and of advertising space. For this reason, it had to appeal to the greatest number of readers to financially survive. To accomplish this objective, it attempted to appeal to two groups who would likely be interested in this sort of publication: civil service employees (who favored an expanded civil service), and taxpayers (the "Public"--which favored a clean government and less taxes).

To attract civil service employees, the Age argued that a magazine which promoted their interest would be of great use in improving their wages and working conditions. The pitch to civil service employees is clear in a full-page self-promotional advertisement in its July 1915 issue:

> THIS MAGAZINE YOUR OWN REPRESENTATIVE. Lawyers have their magazines, doctors the same. Property owners and capitalists theirs. Labor unions have their own organ. NONE OF THESE have, can or will fully and adequately represent you. YOU KNOW IT. You have been the butt of every reformer, the scrapgoat [sic] for every mistake, expense or act of misgovernment. You Public Officials, City Employees, County Employees and School Teachers, the agencies that run government at the will of the people, can now find an open forum in a magazine that is yours--that will really and actually represent you, and you alone . . . [one] run by American Citizens who have acquired first hand information, and who know the trials and tribulations of your life and work. A live up to the minute journal that believes your work is the most

> important in America today, and that it is high time the public knew it and gave you credit for it. SUBSCRIBE NOW.[16]

To appeal to the general public (the second group of readers that was targeted), little adjustment of this editorial position was needed. Information in the magazine explained how the civil service worked and, by doing so, showed the general taxpayer all that the civil service did to protect them. The Age planned to

> tell the citizens how to use their government as they never knew before . . . . You taxpayers will find in this magazine a friend and advisor. We will explain to you how the Departments are run, where your money goes. We will prove to you that the average city employee is just as good a man or woman as you will find in any other occupation; that they have hearts and aims, the same as you have.[17]

To this end, the Civil Service Age carried many items that portrayed how various city departments benefitted the taxpayers--stories that were calculated to convince readers that they needed an active government, and that the Age was a valuable source of information, one worthy of their support.[18] By appealing to these two groups, the editors hoped to attract enough readers to be able to continue publishing.

Of course, subscription fees from these two groups were not enough to keep the Age going. In addition to subscriptions, the Age sold advertising space. Items in the Age spelled out the benefits to advertisers of placing notices in its pages, benefits such as statewide circulation, and a well-defined readership of people with steady incomes.[19]

To supplement advertising income, the company that published the Age sold related information to whoever would buy it. In fact, the Civil Service Age was only one facet of the Civil Service Age Publishing Company, housed in editor Powell's law office.[20] In addition to publishing the Age, the company supplied information about municipal governments across the country, as well as about problems and issues in city management.[21] The company also sold publications aimed at aiding civil service employees in doing their job better, or in how to take and pass a promotion exam.[22]

Editors' pressures

Not only did societal and economic pressures play a part in shaping the Civil Service Age, the editor's own predilections shaped it as well.[23] If the great number of articles he penned and his control of the editorial page is any indication, editor Henry Powell was the driving force behind the Age.

Little survives concerning Powell's early years, other than what he revealed in a lengthy serial autobiography which appeared in the Age.[24] When read in light of the pressures already discussed, it appears reasonable to say that Powell's experiences as a civil service employee, and his involvement first as the League's secretary and later as its main public voice, also helps explains the partisan nature and editorial stance of the publication.

After being a soldier and working in various labor camps, Powell was drawn to the civil service by the twin attractions of financial security and importance of the work. However, his experience as a civil service employee completely undercut his idealized view. Although Seattle municipal employees worked under a once-reformed civil service, in Powell's view little had changed from the era of bossism and the spoils system.[25]

In such a corrupt system, wrote Powell, the employees who succeeded were not the bright, innovative ones, but those "with the biggest bluff, the men who spent their time and money developing political connections." The ones who ultimately suffered were honest employees and taxpayers (the two groups at which the *Age* was aimed).[26]

When he publicly denounced in the *Age* the corruption that he saw both in city government and in the local press, Powell was fired from his job.[27] But Powell would not be silenced; as the publisher of the *Civil Service Age*, wrote Powell, he continued to fight for improvements in civil service system and for an honest city government.

Given what we know of the social and economic pressures of the time and of Powell's background, the seeming mismatch of editorial tone (partisan) to source of funding (commercial) can be understood as a combination of these pressures. The *Age*'s promotion of the civil service was due to Powell's apparent commitment to bettering the lot of civil service employees. Because the Civil Service League was not an official dues-paying union, commercial funding was necessary to put the publication on firmer financial footing, as well as to likely boost credibility with the taxpayers, who might have looked askance at a publication partially aimed at them but funded by a particular group with an interest that appeared at first glance to be contrary to their own.

Initial commercial success

Subscriptions, advertising revenue, and associated sales of reform information were initially enough to keep the *Civil Service Age* going. Judging from the growth of the publication, the editorial strategy worked well. The length of the magazine grew from 12 to 16 pages by July 1915, to 18 pages in April 1916, and by October 1916--a year and a half old--the *Age* was consistently at least 22 pages long. Concerning readership, the only listing in *Ayer's* that shows readership is Powell's estimate of 4,000. However, circulation as claimed in the magazine was much higher. It grew from 100 initial subscribers to more than 5,000 new readers every month. By April 1917, the *Age* claimed it had "thirty-thousand-odd" readers.[28]

Its growing fortunes were also reflected in the amount of advertising. No advertising other than self-promotion appeared in the *Age* until the third issue. In May 1915, it carried only 5 column-inches of advertising. However, by the time it was a year old, it carried 138 column-inches.[29]

IV. THE CHANGES IN EDITORIAL STANCE

The combination of social and economic pressures, and editors' influence together shaped the Civil Service Age. The magazine was targeted at civil service employees and at taxpayers; the Age explicitly championed the need for a strong civil service that would keep the city employees happy and the taxpayers safe. This emphasis also fit the business nature of the Age; Powell needed to attract both groups to secure enough subscription fees and advertising for the Age to stay in business, and such an editorial stance appeased both groups.

But to what degree did Powell support civil service reform? Were there any limits to the reforms he would support on behalf of the civil service employees? Upon first look, the Civil Service Age appears to be unconditionally committed to improving the civil service. However, this assessment becomes inadequate when we examine the circumstances surrounding the changes in editorial stance that we see in its pages.

Certainly the Age supported what it felt to be legitimate claims by the civil service employees for better pay and working conditions. However, that is not to say that Powell and the Age were pro-labor across the board. A line was drawn between legitimate grievances and traitorous demands, and it was sticking to this line even when the temperament of his major group of readers changed that ultimately did in Powell and the Civil Service Age, and that provide clues to Powell's and the Age's deep-seated allegiances.

Fracturing of the readership

Although the Age championed reform, it was far from advocating drastic social or political reforms. The Age editors felt that slow, evolutionary change was best:

> Beware of him who would uproot [the current government] branch and trunk, to remedy natural defects. In the very nature of things, those forms and rules under which thousands of people live and become accustomed to, must change slowly, and gradually.[30]

What likely provoked this homily was the rising social tensions in Seattle which accelerated during the WWI years. Seattle's social groups, like those in the rest of the country, began to polarize as the scope and significance of the Great War and the Bolshevik Revolution--as well as the sudden provisional nature of the world once thought to be so stable--began to be recognized.[31]

Not only was Powell reacting to national and international events, he was also reacting to the growing presence of a powerful, organized coalition of labor groups in Seattle, and the threat it represented of drastic, revolutionary change.[32] Predictably, some of Powell's harshest words were used in denouncing the Industrial Workers of the World, whom he detested for their tactics as well as for their goals:

> Anything that bases its existence on destruction, terror and confusion is foredoomed to fail utterly . . . . [society] never forgives nor condones blind destruction. The I.W.W. must go.[33]

Responding to recent riots in St. Louis, Powell wrote "well may we view with terror such organizations as the I.W.W., with their destructive doctrines and cold-blooded, calculating leaders." His preferred tactics for dealing with labor unrest left little to the imagination. Among the measures Powell favored to counter Wobbly agitation included "a machine gun detail on every [police force] . . ."[34]

However, Powell's and the Age's step-at-a-time approach to reform was not fast enough for those city employees who were unimpressed with the tepid "reforms" for which the Age took credit.[35] Talk began in the ranks about forming an official public service union that would be affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, thereby drawing on the much greater size and power of that organization to push through more fundamental reforms.[36]

Immediately, many articles appeared in the Age that attempted to dissuade civil service employees from creating such a union; unions were just for "workers in the crafts," and the primary tactic of labor--the strike--was not suitable for public employees because of the public's dependence on the essential services that public employees provided.[37] In addition to editorially stated reasons, there was certainly a pragmatic reason for the Age to oppose an AFL-affiliated union. If employees joined organized labor, the Seattle Union Record-a labor-funded paper--would likely draw away too many readers for the Age to survive.[38]

Despite their number, the Age's objections were not persuasive enough. Following a minor victory in a March 1917 meeting, in which the Civil Service League officially denounced the effort to create a union, the tables slowly turned.[39] By January 1918, between 35 and 50 municipal employees had pledged their support for a public service union.[40] Despite the Civil Service League's and the *Age*'s objections, the Public Service Union Local No. 15,924 was voted into being in February, 1918.[41]

Changes in editorial stance

Powell's and the *Age*'s change in editorial stance toward the union was actually two changes. The first change was from adamant opposition to the union to an acceptance of it; this coincided with the union's official formation. The second change was from acceptance to virulent opposition, which coincided with the Seattle General Strike and the *Civil Service Age*'s final edition. How these took place is worth outlining in more detail.

Before the Public Service Union officially existed, Powell had adamantly opposed its formation, as we have seen. However, upon its formation, his opposition began to soften. Other than carrying short reports about what went on at the union meetings,[42] Powell reserved explicit editorial comment on the newly-formed union until November, 1918, when he recanted his earlier opposition because it was "in opposition to most of our readers . . ."[43]

Powell justified this change by saying that times had changed, and that officials who had not heeded the need for speedier improvements in wages and working conditions had forced municipal employees to take this step. Those who wanted a union, wrote Powell, "have simply demonstrated that they possess the prescience of business men, who long ago recognized the potency of organization."[44]

Therefore, up until November 1918, Powell supported the union, largely because it was to be "non-combatant" and "strongly opposed to strikes in public service."[45] But events current and immediately coming caused him to re-evaluate his position once again.

One set of events had to do with the declining fortunes of the _Civil Service Age_. By autumn of 1918, it was in bad financial trouble. The demands of America's effort during WWI were rapidly draining personnel as well as material reserves of the _Age_. In addition to the rationing of paper and other printing supplies, many workers--including his editorial partner Arthur Borderud--left to fight overseas.[46]

Other events had to do with the polarizing social climate. In January, 1919, street riots--one to protest American intervention in Siberia, and a second to protest what labor saw as the extreme reaction by police to the first--portended labor's more radical move yet to come.[47]

That more radical move occurred on February 6, 1919, when close to 60,000 union members (including members of the Public Service Union) refused to go to work. What became known as the

Seattle General Strike lasted for an entire week, effectively shutting down the city's commercial activity.[48]

Reaction to the General Strike was shrill and immediate, for the Public felt it had good reason to fear labor unrest. By 1919, the Bolsheviks had held power for two years in Russia, a communist faction has risen to power in Hungary, and other international events spurred many Americans' worries about revolution. The Seattle General Strike was viewed as the first sign of an impending Bolshevik revolution in America.[49]

The Strike was negotiated to a nonviolent end, but its disruption helped usher in the end of the Civil Service Age. The March, 1919 issue was its last.

It is in the wake of the General Strike when we see the second change in editorial stance. Men who, in November, had been "business men who recognized the potency of organization" were, by March, "a bunch of wild men, drunk on Bolshevism."[50] Their foremost crime was participation in the strike after the assurance that they would not strike, wrote Powell in the final issue of the Age:

> We thought you had more sense and hoped you had more loyalty to the service which gives you a living. You have been fined your vacation, and some of you some fifteen days. By the Gods you should have been fired.[51]

For an editor and publication that had spent so much time promoting the civil service employees, this change was sudden and quite severe. No hint of such a change existed in any previous issues.

In view of this change, the earlier assessment of Powell being primary allied with the civil service employees comes under doubt. The changes in editorial stance also cast doubt on the degree to which Powell's ideas about civil service reform coincided with those of the civil service employees themselves. It is to these questions that we now turn.

V. DISCUSSION

As was stated at the beginning, the substantive questions to be addressed are: Was the _Civil Service Age_ aligned with any identifiable causes or groups? If so, what were they, and for what reasons was the _Age_ aligned with them? And, lastly, how did these affiliations change through the term of the _Age_, and how might these changes be explained?

It appears that the _Age_ was indeed aligned with particular groups: civil service employees and the taxpayers. For personal as well as pragmatic reasons, and judging from the amount of stories aimed at each group, the _Age_ was primarily aligned with civil service employees and secondarily aligned with the taxpayers. This was no contradiction; Powell pointed out time and time again that a strong civil service benefitted the taxpayers as well as the civil service employees.

However, the extent--and limits--of his commitment to the aims of civil service employees can be seen in his attitude toward radical labor and the formation of the civil service union. We have seen that Powell unwaveringly condemned radical labor. Concerning the civil service union, Powell initially opposed it, then grudgingly supported it, if for no other reason than he would have lost many subscribers.

But Powell's later damning of the civil service employees and their participation in the General Strike indicates that the employees went far beyond the legitimate means of redressing grievances. In short, Powell's attitudes toward labor and unions suggest that his support of the aims of civil service employees had very real limits.

Additional clues to Powell's stance can be found by actively interrogating the language in the Age--by asking questions about the underlying categories and assumptions that we see in its pages.[52] When we do, Powell's stated allegiance to civil service employees becomes less and less convincing.

Indeed, contrary to Powell's stated allegiance to the civil service employees, a good case can be made that the primary allegiance of the Civil Service Age was never with the civil service employees, but with the taxpayers--the "Public." Although the entire run of the Age contains many examples, two points in particular lend support to this assertion.

The first point has to do with the manner in which Powell promoted his allegiances. It is clear in the pages of the Age that Powell meant readers to understand that aiding the civil service employees was his primary cause, and that the by-product of such action would also benefit the Public. However, what undercuts and complicates this interpretation is how Powell went about it.

Powell spent a great amount of time and space stating his firm allegiance to the causes of the civil service employees. They had been getting the short shrift in compensation, in working conditions, and in general reputation and, to paraphrase Powell, it was high time the Public knew it and gave them credit for it. In addition, Powell's lengthy 7-part serial autobiography which appeared in the Age spelled out his outrage at the dishonesty and inefficiency that he witnessed as an honest civil service employee, as well as his drive and commitment to improving its compensation for employees and its effectiveness for taxpayers.

However, it is likely that he spent this much time and space because he was attempting to build a firm alliance, not simply celebrate one. When the Age first appeared in March 1915, he was working as a lawyer and small-business owner in addition to his civil service job; in March 1916, he left the civil service entirely and devoted all his energies to his law practice and his publishing business. Civil service employees likely questioned his commitment to the cause when his words (pro-employees) were seen in terms of his actual place in society: essentially a middle-class entrepreneur and businessman.

In other words, the incessant parading of his allegiance to civil service employees and their cause was not to powerfully and publicly state his allegiance, but to allay doubts among that particular readership about his commitment, and to justify the honesty of his intentions.

One must also see Powell's effort in the context of his other readership group. Compared with the tough-talking, almost melodramatic statements in favor of the civil service employees, the "pitch" aimed at the Public was much more restrained. And this makes sense; contrary to the doubt civil service employees felt about having a lawyer and small-businessman lobby for a labor group (doubt that manifested itself in the group's move toward organized labor), Powell's allegiance to the Public required milder language to express, precisely because he felt his allegiance to it was not in question.

In this way, Powell's primary allegiance to the Public was the one that was _not_ announced; it was recessed because it was acknowledged and unchallenged. It remained recessed, but, when overtly challenged by the General Strike, his allegiance to the Public emerged absolute.

The second point to support an assertion that Powell's editorial stance actually remained consistently aligned with the Public throughout the life of the _Age_ has to do with how he used the term "taxpayers."

In the final section of this paper, I have used "the Public" interchangeably with "the taxpayers" for a reason. I capitalize "Public" because Powell did not use it in the generic sense of opposition to some "private" realm, or as the civilian realm as opposed to a military one. Instead, "taxpayer" and "Public" have very special meanings in this magazine at this time.

Logically, those who work--be it at the shipyards or at the downtown office--pay taxes. Hence, by definition, they are taxpaying members of the general public.

Although civil service employees (as well as labor in general) certainly were taxpayers in this strictly material sense, for Powell they were quite distinct from the taxpaying Public. Rather than being merely a functional, transparent label, the words "taxpayer" and "Public" in the pages of the Age are terms with special significance: They signify the segment of society that is middle-class, propertied, with a stake in the existing social system.[53] When the opposition of "the taxpayers (the Public)" to "labor (Revolutionaries)" is understood in terms of Powell's own allegiances, the fact that Powell distinguishes between these two groups makes perfect sense.

In sum, although the Civil Service Age appeared to champion civil service employees, it was far less devoted to them than the Age explicitly suggests. Indeed, the additional interpretations brought to bear on the empirical evidence suggest the continuity of the Age's alignment with the Public, and not with the labor group it so desperately courted. Civil service reform was allowable and desirable--only as long as it did not overstep the bounds that Powell and the Public had set for it.

If one accepts that the Civil Service Age was always primarily aligned with the Public rather than with the group that it courted much more stridently, we now have evidence not only of how partisanship was used in a later time, but, much more importantly, of how the purpose of using it was quite contrary to the orthodox tradition rooted in classical liberalism and the Lockean theory of language.

Indeed, we can detect at least two major differences in partisanship between the "orthodox" partisan papers of the early 19th Century and the Civil Service Age. One difference is the effort to secure funding primarily through commercial rather than non-commercial sources.

The other difference is the purpose to which partisanship was put. In the pages of the Age, the partisan form was retained and, with it, the tradition of explicitly stating one's true allegiances and the faith that the magazine actually presented them. However, as the above analysis suggests, this partisan form was not used to state intentions, but to hide them; not to clarify allegiances, but to obscure them. We did not see Powell's allegiances; we saw those that he hoped to project.

VI. CONCLUDING COMMENTS: PARTISANSHIP AS SOCIAL PRACTICE

The example of the Civil Service Age suggests the advantages of studying partisanship as a social practice. The advantage is that the artificial periodization into "eras" can be replaced with a more integrated understanding of continually changing uses of language in those institutions in which the production of messages (texts) is the primarily purpose.

With this perspective, journalism historians might move beyond assertions that newspapers left an "old" world for a "new" one or a "traditional" world for a "modern" one, and simply became free and independent, or simply took on the values of "business" or of "capitalism." Indeed, the tracing and understanding of the continual appropriation and reappropriation of earlier practices within material contexts of competing social groups might help journalism historians regain an integrated, more inclusive view of the history of journalism and how it fits into the larger social sphere.

These concerns suggest a much larger project. The overall goal of such a project would be a history of the practice of partisanship: its philosophical roots, and its material manifestations as a developing social practice from its beginnings to the present.

Such a project might also yield valuable conceptual tools with which to understand more deeply the nature of partisanship today. For, as we well know, accusations of "bias" or "partisanship" are always leveled whenever critics recognize the declarative, strident style of "partisan-writing."

However, as this study suggests, we may miss detecting allegiances (that have very real, material consequences) if we hold on to this simplistic view.

For example, as many scholars have suggested, the "frame" in which "content" appears contributes a great deal to its meanings.[54] In today's mass media, the use of "non-partisan," "objective" writing (when seen in the institutional and semiotic frame in which it takes place) not only tells us about the legitimate newswriting practices of today, it says a lot about the nature of partisanship in our own era.

NOTES

Thanks go to Bonnie Brennen, Jerry Davey, John Erickson, Hanno Hardt, Jeff Rutenbeck, and Jeff Smith, as well as to the History Division judges for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this paper.

[1] For an useful if somewhat superficial overview of libertarian philosophy as it applies to journalism, see William L. Rivers, Theodore Peterson, and Jay W. Jensen, eds., *The Mass Media and Modern Society*, 2nd. ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971), pp. 67-85.

[2] For specific discussions of this facet of Locke's philosophy and its implications for the study of communication and culture, see John Durham Peters, "John Locke, the Individual, and the Origin of Communication," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 75:4 (November 1989):387-399; Thomas Streeter, "Polysemy, Plurality, and Media Studies," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 13:2 (Summer 1989):88-106.

[3] For an overview and critique of Locke's ideas about language, see Jonathon Bennett, *Locke, Berkeley, Hume: Central themes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. 1-11. For a more detailed discussion, see Norman Kretzmann, "The Main Thesis of Locke's Semantic Theory," in *Locke on Human Understanding: Selected Essays*, ed. I.C. Tipton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), pp. 126-128.

[4] Prominent examples include William E. Ames, *A History of the National Intelligencer* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972); and Gerald J. Baldasty, "The Press and Politics in the Age of Jackson," *Journalism Monographs* 89 (August 1984); Carolyn Stewart Dyer, "Political Patronage of the Wisconsin Press, 1849-1860: New Perspectives on the Economics of Patronage," *Journalism Monographs* 109 (February 1989).

[5] The "dark ages" phrase is from Frank Luther Mott, *American Journalism*, 3rd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1962), pp. 167-169. The "golden ages" phrase is from Robert Rutland, *The Newsmongers: Journalism in the Life of the Nation, 1690-1972* (New York: Dial Press, 1973), p. 82-84. Rutland echoes the position first articulated in Ames, p. ix.

[6] This emphasis on language may be mistaken for a misguided attempt to recover elements of a "writing style." I do not mean it as such. Unlike those researchers who conduct abstract analyses of writing style separate from an historical context,

---

or those who conduct purely organizational analyses with no attention to the product (news) that these organizations produce, I wish to emphasize the co-determined nature of culture and material conditions. Each is affected by the other; a complete analysis must address the interactions between them.

The work of Raymond Williams is particularly helpful to a scholar with these concerns. For a statement of this perspective as it applies to the study of communication, see Raymond Williams, "Communications and Cultural Science," Journal of Communication 24:3 (Summer 1974):17-25. A more comprehensive theoretical statement of an alternative to idealism as well as economic reductionism is Raymond Williams, "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory," in Problems in Materialism and Culture (London: Verso, 1980), pp. 31-49.

[7] The entire four-year run of the Civil Service Age (formerly the Civil Service News) is available at the Library at the University of Washington, Seattle, and at the Seattle Public Library.

[8] Elliot Shore's study of the Appeal to Reason (a mass-produced labor publication in early 1900s America) is particularly relevant to this study. He discusses the tensions--economic and ideological--that the publisher attempted to resolve. Shore makes the case that adopting the techniques of the mainstream press (such as the broadening of content to boost circulation) increased its circulation for a time but destroyed its effectiveness as a radical voice. See "Selling Socialism: the Appeal to Reason and the radical press in turn-of-the-century America," Media, Culture and Society 7:2 (April 1985):147-168. The book-length study is Elliot Shore, Talkin' Socialism: J.A. Wayland and the Role of the Press in American Radicalism, 1890-1912 (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1988.)

[9] The literature on the Progressive era is voluminous; some works applied more directly than others to this project. Specifically, Martin Schiesl, The Politics of Efficiency: Municipal Administration and Reform in America 1800-1920 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977) presents a very useful discussion of Progressive reform at the level of city government. Samuel Haber, Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964) discusses the ideology of efficiency upon which Progressives modeled their reform efforts.

[10] Robert Donald Saltvig, "The Progressive Movement in Washington," (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1966), p. 189. The organizing zeal is examined on a national

---

scale in Robert H. Wiebe, Businessmen and Reform: A Study of the Progressive Movement (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), pp. 16-41.

[11] Lee Forrest Pendergrass, "Urban Reform and Voluntary Association: A Case Study of the Seattle Municipal League, 1910-1929," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1972), pp. 13-20, 51.

[12] Charles Byler, "Austin E. Griffiths: Seattle Progressive Reformer," Pacific Northwest Quarterly 76 (January 1985):25. See also Wiebe, p. 212.

[13] Judging from references in the Civil Service Age, cities such as San Francisco and Chicago also had organizations that represented civil service employees. See "Civil Service Organizations," Civil Service Age, August 1915, p. 14; editorial, Civil Service Age, January 1916, p. 3.

[14] The only information about Borderud that could be found was after the period of this study. A listing in Polk's Directory for Seattle 1920, described Borderud as a bookkeeper who lived at 823 Madison Street; in Polk's 1925, he was listed as married to Anne, and working as a salesman for the Crane Company.

[15] Precious little information outside of that in the Civil Service Age is available about Powell and the other employees of the Age. Listings in Polk's confirm his Seattle residence and livelihood. However no listing for Powell could be found in manuscript censuses of 1910 which might yield a date and place of birth. Roscoe Brown did not show up in any volume of Polk's.

[16] Advertisement, Civil Service News, July 1915, p. 2. For an editorial that expressed identical sentiments, see "Something About Us. Why We Are On Earth," Civil Service News, March 1915, p. 3.

[17] "Something About Us. Why We Are On Earth."

[18] For example, see "Cost of Government," Civil Service Age, October 1917, p. 4; "The Department of Public Utilities: How It Serves the People," Civil Service Age, August 1915, p. 4.

[19] "Notice to Merchants," Civil Service News, April 1915, p. 12; "Our Advertising Record," Civil Service Age, March 1916, p. 7.

[20] The initial office was 88 Jackson Street, which also was the location of the print shop that produced the Age.

Beginning with the July 1915 issue, the company office address in the New York building was the same as Powell's law office.

[21] "Civil Service News. Special Service Bureau," Civil Service News, July 1915, p. 11.

[22] "Civil Service Books You Ought To Read," Civil Service Age, May 1916, p. 14.

[23] Eileen R. Meehan, "Critical Theorizing on Broadcast History," Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media 30:4 (Fall 1986):393-411, usefully illustrates three theoretical frameworks, and how each framework shapes the explanation given. In all these schemes, however, the producers are merely the "arms and legs" of institutional forces without any creative action possible on their part. See p. 395.

[24] Powell's autobiography entitled "The Civil Service Treadmill: Ten Years Under Civil Service" is a seven-part series appearing in every monthly issue (excepting March, 1917) from October 1916 to May 1917. The first installment is unsigned, but later installments all carry the byline of "H. W. Powell." It begins with his release from the military in 1907, and ends earlier in the same year that the series began (1916).

[25] The civil service system had been instituted as part of the revised city charter of 1896. See Stephen I. Miller, "Salary Standardization, city of Seattle, Washington," (report presented to the Municipal Civil Service Commission of Seattle, 1918), p. 1.

[26] H. W. Powell, "The Civil Service Treadmill, Part Three," Civil Service Age, December 1916, p. 6.

[27] Arthur Borderud, "Powell's Removal an Act of Political Piracy," Civil Service Age, May 1916, p. 13; "Gainful Occupation," Civil Service Age, June 1916, p. 5.

[28] "What We Have Done," Civil Service Age, March 1916, p. 6; "Comments," Civil Service Age, April 1917, p. 4; N.W. Ayer's and Son's American Newspaper Annual Directory (Philadelphia: N.W. Ayer and Son, 1915): Ayer's 1917; Ayer's 1920. One should keep in mind that material for Ayer's was collected a year previous to the volume it is in; for example, information for the 1920 edition was collected in 1919.

[29] "Our Advertising Record," Civil Service Age, March 1916, p. 6. Although these claims were not specifically addressed, the impression one gets of increase advertising inches from paging through the Age coincides with these claims.

---

[30] H. W. Powell, "Seeking Efficiency in Government and Getting the Reverse," Civil Service Age, October 1915, p. 4.

[31] The seminal work on the cultural impact of World War I is Paul Fussell, The Great War and Modern Memory (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975).

For a discussion of the statewide context, see Jonathon Dembo, Unions and Politics in Washington State, 1885-1935 (New York: Garland, 1983), and Albert F. Gunns, Civil Liberties in Crisis: The Pacific Northwest, 1917-1940 (New York: Garland, 1983). See Robert L. Friedheim, "The Seattle General Strike of 1919," Pacific Northwest Quarterly 52:3 (July 1961):81-98, for a discussion of the Seattle reaction and resulting milieu.

[32] For a discussion of the growing labor presence in Seattle, see Friedheim, and Pendergrass.

[33] "Whom the Gods Would Destroy They First Make Mad," Civil Service Age, April 1915, p. 3. A good point of entry into the voluminous literature on the I.W.W. is Dione Miles, comp., Something in Common--An IWW Bibliography (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1986). The most comprehensive narrative history is Melvyn Dubofsky, We Shall Be All: A History of the IWW (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969). A useful, up-to-date historiographical survey of IWW studies can be found in Salvatore Salerno, Red November, black November: Culture and community in the Industrial Workers of the World (New York: State University of New York Press, 1989), pp. 20-42.

[34] "Those St. Louis Riots," Civil Service Age, August 1917, p. 3.

[35] The Age advocated vacations for all civil service employees, a target practice range as well as a gymnasium for members of the police force, as well as a variety of minor wage reforms. See "The Age Gets Results," Civil Service Age, August 1916, p. 6. For an overview of the growth of labor in Seattle during WWI, see Pendergrass, p. 86.

[36] "City Employees Consider Union," Civil Service Age, February 1917, p. 18.

[37] "Organize--Certainly," Civil Service Age, February 1917, p. 4; "The Unionization of City Employees," Civil Service Age, February 1917, p. 3; William A. Byrd, IV, "Co-operation With Civil Service Employees' Associations," Civil Service Age, September 1917, p. 18.

[38] The fear was justified. The year that the Age quit, the Union Record's claimed circulation took an immense jump from the reported figure of 7,663 for readers of the weekly edition

---

in 1916, to a publisher's estimate of 60,000 for the newly created daily edition, and 10,000 for the weekly by 1919. See *Ayer's 1917*, *Ayer's 1920*.

[39]"Stalwart Civil Service Organization Rejects Unionism," *Civil Service Age*, March 1917, p. 14. One can catch the growing impatience with the lack of change in the various public statements made during these months in which the sentiment changed. See letter to the editor, Seattle *Union Record*, 21 July 1917, p. 3; "City Employees Want Organization," Seattle *Union Record*, 28 July 1917, p. 6; Walter Thorburn, "Why City Employees Are Drifting Into Unionism," *Civil Service Age*, August 1917, p. 5

[40]"Municipal Clerks to Unionize," *Civil Service Age*, January 1918, p. 17. This number appears quite insignificant when compared with the total of 2900 city employees as of November 30, 1918. See "Employees, City of Seattle. November 30, 1918," *Annual Report, Seattle Civil Service Commission* (1918). The self-interest of the *Age* editors in understating the extent of support likely had some effect on this published figure; unfortunately, no information has yet been found that sheds additional light on the extent to which city employees supported this move. However, Powell's grudging admission that opposition to the union was "in opposition to most of our readers" indicates a level of support high enough to make this admission a necessary one. See "Firemanic Unions," *Civil Service Age*, November 1918, p. 3.

[41]"Public Service Union Elects," Seattle *Union Record*, 9 February 1918, p. 5; "Public Service Union," *Civil Service Age*, March 1918, p. 7; "City and County Public Service Union No. 15924," *Civil Service Age*, April 1918, pp. 7-8.

[42]"Late Proceedings of City and County Public Service Union," *Civil Service Age*, May 1918, p. 14; "City and County Public Service Union," *Civil Service Age*, June 1918, p. 7; "A Good Union," *Civil Service Age*, July 1918, p. 4.

[43]"Firemanic Unions."

[44]Ibid.

[45]Walter Thorburn, "Explains Purpose and Policy of City and County Public Service Union," *Civil Service Age*, August 1918, p. 6.

[46]"Where Do We Go From Here?," *Civil Service Age*, July 1918, p. 4; "Off to the Wars," *Civil Service Age*, August 1918, p. 3; "Now at Camp Lewis," *Civil Service Age*, August 1918, p. 12. For notices to readers explaining the problems, see "An Apology," *Civil Service Age*, August 1918, p. 3; "IMPORTANT.

Notice to Subscribers," Civil Service Age, August 1918, p. 9; "Our Subscribers' Loyalty," Civil Service Age, September 1918, p. 3; "Essential News," Civil Service Age, October 1918, p. 1.

Based on listings in Ayer's 1915, Ayer's 1917, Ayer's 1920, the publishing business in Seattle for weeklies and dailies did indeed decline after the war:

	1914	1916	1919
Monthlies	28	36	35
Weeklies	33	34	20
Dailies	10	10	7

[47] Friedheim, pp. 83.

[48] For an informal discussion of the strike and its political fallout, see Murray Morgan, Skid Road (New York: The Viking Press, 1951), pp. 199-217. See Friedheim for an exhaustive account that primarily addresses the question of whether or not labor was unified and intentional in the strike. For additional listings of articles about the Seattle General Strike, see appropriate subject headings in Miles.

[49] Friedheim.

[50] "The Late Strike," Civil Service Age, March 1919, p. 4. See Friedheim, p. 82.

[51] Ibid. Although the Civil Service Age disappeared, the Civil Service League did not. It was listed as one of the supporting organizations for a statewide merit system in 1939. See Washington Merit System Association, "Merit System Law Proposed for the State of Washington," (typewritten manuscript, Pacific Northwest Collection, University of Washington, 1939).

[52] For an interesting discussion of these facets of historical interpretation as they apply to journalism history, see Catherine Covert, "'Jumbled, Disparate, and Trivial': Problems in the Use of Newspapers as Historical Evidence," The Maryland Historian 12:1 (Spring 1981):47-60.

[53] As we know from the social context, taxpayers ("the Public") were at very real odds with labor groups in Seattle at this time. Too, it seems that any challenge to the status quo was tagged with the "revolution" label. Writes Dubofsky: "More frightening to most Americans than bolshevism was labor unrest, which was sometimes equated with revolution in the public, as well as the business, mind." See pp. 452-3.

---

[54] For example, see Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988) as well as Chomsky's critiques of the press. For an example of theoretically more sophisticated work, see Stuart Hall, "The determinations of news photographs," in Stanley Cohen and Jock Young (eds.), The Manufacture of News, rev. ed. (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1981), pp. 226-245.

ALICE ALLISON DUNNIGAN: PIONEER BLACK WOMAN JOURNALIST

Rodger Streitmatter
The American University
Washington, D.C.

Presented to the History Division of the
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
Annual Convention in Minneapolis, Minnesota,
August 9, 1990

ALICE ALLISON DUNNIGAN: PIONEER BLACK WOMAN JOURNALIST

There have been advances in African-American history and women's history in recent decades, but scholarship regarding the struggles and contributions of black women is still severely limited. As a presence and a force in the history of the United States, black women remain largely invisible. The specialized field of journalism history has followed this trend, with few journalism historians having focused on the contributions of African-American women journalists.(1)

The only black woman who receives a paragraph in the standard history of American journalism is Ida B. Wells-Barnett.(2) Wells-Barnett, the daughter of slaves, became an owner of the Memphis Free Speech and wrote eloquent anti-lynching editorials. In 1892, lynching advocates destroyed her newspaper--but not her crusade. She published America's first in-depth study of lynching and continued to lecture on the topic in this country and abroad.(3) As meritorious as Wells-Barnett's accomplishments were, the contributions of black women journalists did not cease with her death in 1931.

The increased scholarship regarding black women in journalism is well documented by comparing the space devoted to black women in the three histories of American women in journalism. Ishbel Ross made no mention of Wells-Barnett in her 1936 book, Ladies of the Press.(4) Marion Marzolf devoted a paragraph to Wells-Barnett and two pages to black women in her 1977 book, Up From the Footnote: A History of Women Journalists.(5) And Kay Mills included two pages on Wells-Barnett and a twenty-two-page chapter on "Women of Color" in her 1988 book, A Place in the

News: From the Women's Pages to the Front Page.(6)

The goal of this paper is to examine the life and work of a twentieth century African-American woman who is remarkable both for her journalistic accomplishments and for her lack of recognition by journalism historians: Alice Allison Dunnigan.(7) The broader goal is to enlarge the body of knowledge regarding the contributions of African-American women journalists. That broader goal has particular significance in this study because examination of Dunnigan's life and work indicates that her experiences were not always in concert with those of other American women journalists. For this paper paints a portrait of a woman whose experiences varied, in at least several ways, from those of other twentieth century women journalists whom historians have studied. The findings here suggest, therefore, that the experiences of black women journalists, at least those working in the black press this century, may have been different from those of white women journalists working in the mainstream press during the same period.(8)

On January 1, 1947, Alice Allison Dunnigan became Washington bureau chief for the Associated Negro Press,(9) and quickly established her place in Washington journalism history: In June 1947, Dunnigan became the first black woman to receive credentials to cover the United States Congress.(10) In August of that year, she became the first of her race and gender accredited to cover the White House. That same month, she became the first black woman to receive like credentials to report from the United States Department of State, the United States Supreme Court, and the District of Columbia Police Department. In 1948, she added the distinction of becoming the first black woman journalist to travel with the president of the United States.(11)

Like other professional journalists, Dunnigan made her major contributions through her written work.(12) Between 1947 and 1961, she wrote hundreds of news articles that appeared in one hundred black newspapers in the United States and Africa.(13) She reported news events important to black Americans, increasing their awareness of the progress of their race in American society and, consequently, the potential strength of their race as a united force. She also investigated and illuminated human injustices against African-Americans. Had it not been for Dunnigan, some of these injustices may have gone unnoticed, because hers may well have been the only articles reporting them. The specific impact of her individual news stories is impossible to assess, but their aggregate benefit to the advancement of her race is impossible to deny. By covering events of interest and importance to the African-American community, Dunnigan helped to build a consciousness among black Americans and, thereby, to push civil rights onto the national agenda. Ultimately, then, Dunnigan helped to move this nation closer to the eradication of racial discrimination.

One clear distinction between Dunnigan and most other women journalists was the type and magnitude of the events that she covered. From the day they entered the newsroom, women reporters were banned from covering major news events. They were pushed, instead, toward coverage of weddings, social events, parties, and the like. Ross observed in her 1936 book: "They have made surprisingly little progress on the front page, which is still the critical test."(14) Likewise, Mills said that, through the 1950s: "Newspapers rarely hired women. When they did, it was to work on the women's section."(15) In Mills's chapter on women of color, she suggested that black women had the same difficulty struggling to escape from the "society page ghetto." And Marzolf wrote that black women journalists who broke into the profession in the 1950s were limited to writing for the society and religion pages.(16)

But this was never the case with Dunnigan. Beginning with her first day on the job, she wrote breaking national affairs stories from the nation's capital.(17) Her first assignment was to cover the ousting of Mississippian Theodore Bilbo from the United States Senate because of conduct unbecoming to his office,(18) and she continued to cover both houses of Congress.(19) She also routinely covered the Supreme Court,(20) the White House,(21) the Defense Department,(22) the State Department,(23) other federal agencies and departments,(24) and District of Columbia police and courts.(25)

In addition, she covered national politics(26) and higher education,(27) wrote investigative pieces,(28) and followed the emergence of the civil rights movement.(29) When an appropriate subject developed, Dunnigan also switched to a column format and gave readers her personal opinion.(30)

Among her biggest stories was her 1947 disclosure of the contents of a confidential report summarizing how well black troops had performed during World War II. Her story appeared nine months before President Truman used the contents of the report to help him justify banning racial discrimination in the armed forces.(31) She exposed police brutality against black women, leading to an investigation by the local branch of the NAACP.(32) She covered the action that forced a Washington hotel to become the first in the nation's capital to integrate.(33) In 1948, Dunnigan covered the first mass rally that called for abolishing the poll tax, banning segregation in interstate transportation, and creating a Fair Employment Practice Commission.(34) That fall she scooped every other news organization in the country by reporting that President Truman would include civil rights in his 1948 presidential platform.(35)

Dunnigan was allowed to cover major news stories because of the same force that so often has played a powerful role in American journalism: economics. The black press in this country always has been plagued by financial difficulties because of the black community's limited economic resources.(36) Black newspapers always have been handicapped by insufficient advertising that has led to low wages.(37) Historically, black newspapers in this country have survived an average of only nine years.(38) The Associated Negro Press, like the black newspapers it served, always struggled with insufficient funds.(39) It was not unusual for Dunnigan's paycheck to arrive late.(40) Nor was ANP's Washington bureau well equipped. There was no one in the office to answer the telephone when Dunnigan was not there,(41) and she had to supply her own typewriter, typing paper, carbon paper, notebooks, pens, envelopes, and stamps.(42)

But Dunnigan's primary motivation for joining the ANP staff was neither to secure a large income nor to work in a plush environment. She began working for the national news service because of a life-long quest to relieve her deep-seated feelings of inferiority and inadequacy. While she was growing up in rural Kentucky, Alice Allison had developed low self-esteem. Other children had made fun of her because she had a light complexion and was fat,(43) her mother had warned her that no one would marry her,(44) and her father had discouraged her from attending school--even though that was the one area of her life in which Alice excelled.(45) So Alice had escaped her unhappy childhood by turning to fantasy, dreaming that someday she would become a newspaper reporter. In her autobiography, Dunnigan recalled the pledge she had made as a youngster: "I'll write for a newspaper and let people know what other people are doing. I'll go around speaking to people about the proper way to live, and advise them on how they can have a better life."(46)

Dunnigan had begun writing for a newspaper when she was only thirteen years old(47) and had worked part time for several newspapers,(48) but, by the age of forty, she still had not fulfilled her dream of working fulltime as a reporter. To do so in the nation's capital meant fulfillment of Alice Allison Dunnigan's lifelong ambition--regardless of the size of the paycheck.(49)

For this reason, Dunnigan left the government job that had brought her to Washington and accepted ANP's low salary. When she began working fulltime for ANP, Dunnigan wrote for only one-half cent per word, which amounted to thirty dollars for an entire month. At the end of a three-month trial period, Dunnigan's salary was increased to twenty-five dollars a week.(50) Dunnigan's annual salary, therefore, was $1,200. That figure was barely half of the average salary that black men working in Washington at that time were earning.(51) Her ANP salary also was less than half the $2,600 annual salary she had been earning before leaving government service.(52) But she turned down at least one government job offer in order to continue working as a Washington reporter.(53)

Another way in which Dunnigan differed from most women reporters was with regard to the quality of her writing. For her journalistic strength was not derived from an ability to write eloquent prose. Women journalists, who often have been attracted to the profession because of its literary aspects, traditionally have excelled in writing. They have been stronger writers than reporters. All three major histories of women journalists have discussed the fact that writing has tended to be the element that has set women journalists apart from their male counterparts.(54)

With Dunnigan, however, her spirit and ambition as a news reporter surpassed the quality of her news writing. The copy that Dunnigan sent to ANP's home office in Chicago frequently had to be rewritten.(55) Specifically, ANP founder Claude A. Barnett criticized Dunnigan's writing as being too wordy,(56) and ANP Executive Editor Frank Marshall Davis told her that she used incomplete sentences, committed capitalization errors, used first person pronouns in her stories, and created words that did not exist.(57) Dunnigan's writing initially was of such poor quality that Barnett arranged for a Howard University professor to help her improve her grammar.(58)

An analysis of Dunnigan's published stories shows that her writing was plagued with various problems with grammar and writing style. In particular, her lead paragraphs tended to be long, awkward, and convoluted. Rarely did Dunnigan write a crisp lead befitting the significant news she was reporting. For example, when Dunnigan reported that presidents of black colleges had renewed their fight against segregation, her lead paragraph was too long, was cluttered with unnecessary details, and contained a capitalization error. Her sixty-seven-word lead paragraph read:

> When the seventeen presidents of Negro land-grant colleges departed for their respective States (sic) after having attended a three-day conference in Washington last week, each expressed his determination to continue his fight against the segregated policy now being practiced by the Southern institutions, and to do all in his power to see to it that every American citizen is provided with equal facilities to obtain an education.(59)

The clarity of Dunnigan's writing also was weakened by her use of strained metaphors and her reliance on passive voice. For example, when she learned that Mississippi congressmen were organizing opposition to anti-lynching legislation, she wrote:

> Members of the Mississippi Congressional contingent are busy whetting their hatchets for the three anti-lynching bills on which hearings were begun last week in the Senate

> judiciary committee, and postponed suddenly, without reason, until Feb. 2.(60)

In her feature stories, Dunnigan often tried too hard to touch her readers' emotions. In such cases, her over-reliance on adjectives became distracting and she made the mistake of "telling" her readers rather than "showing" them. For example, when Dunnigan painted a scene of visitors arriving at a Georgia almshouse to interview an inmate there, she wrote this eighty-eight word lead sentence:

> As the three car caravan rolled along the graveled driveway, winding its way across the spacious, well-kept, grassy lawn toward the group of white framed, rectangular buildings, it was greeted by a dignified looking lady of medium height and weight, wearing a crisp, starched, pink print, cotton dress which accentuated her soft, brown, velvety complexion, and the glossy black hair becomingly arranged in a pompadour across the front, with the back hanging in loose curls around the lobe of the ear and the nape of the neck.(61)

It is understandable that Dunnigan's writing tended to be neither graceful nor technically perfect. The quality of education for black students in the rural South early in the twentieth century was not high,(62) with young black women actually being discouraged from attending school.(63) Education was not compulsory, and no standards guided individual teachers, who could enter the classroom after only one year of college. In addition, young Alice had to overcome many obstacles merely to receive a minimal education. At age four, she began walking four miles a day to reach her one-room schoolhouse, and, beginning at age thirteen, she had to wash a neighbor's clothes on a washboard to earn the seventy-five cents a week for her lunch money.(64) Furthermore, Alice's college major was home economics, not English,(65) and it took her nine years to earn the degree because she had to complete all but her first year of study part time while teaching full time.(66)

Nor did reporters working in the black press have the benefit of well-trained or well-compensated editors to correct or improve their writing. If Dunnigan had worked for a major mainstream news organization, many of the errors that detracted from her writing would not have gone into print. Had her writing been well edited before it was published, she could have learned from that editing process.(67)

Another way in which Dunnigan differed from other women journalists was the stage of her life in which she entered the field. Journalism traditionally has been viewed as a young person's occupation, and most successful women journalists have entered the field when they were young, often in their twenties.(68) Ross observed of women journalists: "The present tendency is for them to break in fresh from college."(69) Ross made that statement in 1936--only a decade before Dunnigan entered the field. But, unlike most women reporters, Dunnigan did not turn to journalism in her young adulthood. By the time she accepted her first full-time reporting position, she was forty years old. And her most productive years in journalism were from the ages of forty to fifty-three.(70)

Also, journalism is a very demanding field that often places severe financial, physical, and emotional pressures on reporters. For various combinations of these reasons, most women journalists have entered the field when they were single and without children. Some have continued in the field after they have married and had children, but many others have left the field at that stage.(71) By the time Dunnigan began working fulltime as a journalist, however, she had married, divorced, remarried, borne a child, separated from her second husband, and left her son in the care of her parents.(72)

Dunnigan did not turn to journalism as a full-time vocation until she already had taught school for eighteen years, had worked as a domestic, had operated a laundry from her home, had washed tombstones and dug up wild onions for the Works Progress Administration, and had worked as a government clerk-typist and economist for five years, as well as having held part-time jobs as a dishwasher and domestic.(73)

The story of Dunnigan's early life is one of human endurance and triumph of the human spirit. Alice Allison, the granddaughter of slaves, was born April 27, 1906, in a three-room structure that her father, a sharecropper, had fashioned from a one-room cabin.(74) After graduating at the top of her high school class, she enrolled at Kentucky Normal and Industrial Institute. A year later, at age eighteen, she began teaching in a one-room schoolhouse.(75) Black teachers in rural Kentucky were poorly paid.(76) So, during the summers, Dunnigan hired herself out to clean houses and wash clothes.(77) When food was scarce, she dug through the city dump. She peeled the outside leaves from rotted cabbage and cut the bad spots off spoiled potatoes and apples, taking the rest home for supper. She also scraped the mold from bologna, soaked it overnight in hot water, and served it the next day for breakfast, providing the only meat her family would eat that day.(78)

Alice Dunnigan struggled in her personal life as well. Recalling her mother's warning, Alice, at age nineteen, married the first man who asked her, a dirt farmer whom she divorced only four years later.(79) The next year, she married Charles Dunnigan, a childhood playmate. The difficult marriage continued--at least on paper--for twenty years, but included both mental and physical abuse.(80) In 1932, in the depths of the Depression, Alice Dunnigan gave birth to a son. When Robert was four months old, she was forced to turn him over to her parents to raise so that she could pursue her career. He rejoined his mother seventeen years later.(81)

It was not for lack of desire that Alice Dunnigan did not enter the field of journalism at an earlier age and at an earlier stage in her life; it was because of a lack of opportunity. Becoming a news reporter was a long struggle for a black woman living in the rural South. Alice's hometown, Russellville, Kentucky, had no newspaper, and the weekly newspaper in Logan County did not hire black writers. So thirteen-year-old Alice, in order to work for a newspaper, had to connect with the Owensboro Enterprise, a weekly newspaper seventy-five miles away. For the next two years, Alice wrote one-sentence stories about local happenings. She received no guaranteed payment. Instead, she was paid three cents for every copy of the newspaper she sold.(82)

When Dunnigan reached adulthood, only two occupations were open to black women in the rural South: teaching black children and cleaning white homes.(83) So Dunnigan chose the option closer to newspaper reporting. While teaching, she also wrote parttime for the Louisville Defender. But as soon as the United States recognized that it needed all human resources--black as well as white--if it was to win World War II, Dunnigan saw the opportunity to leave the South and to pursue her life-long dream of becoming a journalist. She took the examination to become a government clerk-typist and, leaving behind her son, she moved to Washington. Soon after her arrival in 1942, she began working part time for ANP.(84)

Dunnigan's life and work experience clearly differed from those of other women journalists in these three ways--covering major news stories, having reporting skills that were stronger than her writing skills, and entering the field at a more advanced stage of her life. But, at the same time, many of her experiences paralleled those of other women journalists. These facets of Dunnigan's journalistic career reinforce previous scholarship relevant to the history of women in journalism.

For example, Dunnigan felt the male prejudice that has been a common denominator in the experiences of women journalists.(85) Dunnigan felt so much male prejudice that she eventually came to believe that sexual discrimination had been a more significant barrier to her than had been racial discrimination. Near the end of her career, Dunnigan stated: "Race and sex were the twin strikes against me from the beginning. I think sex was the most difficult, because I not only had to convince members of the other race of my capability, but had to fight against discrimination of Negro men."(86)

Dunnigan had on-going battles with Claude A. Barnett. Although ANP's founder agreed to hire Dunnigan, he did so only after several male reporters had turned down his offers. Barnett later told Dunnigan: "I was not confident that a girl could do the type of job we needed in Washington."(87) Dunnigan protested Barnett's comment, telling him that he discriminated against women the same way that whites discrimated against blacks.(88)

Barnett's archives of correspondence show that he clearly discriminated against Dunnigan financially, although Dunnigan may not have known it at the time she worked for ANP. Letters in the Claude A. Barnett Papers show that, before offering Dunnigan her job, he had offered the same job to one man for $200 a month(89) and to another for $250 a month.(90) But when Dunnigan accepted the job, he paid her only $100 a month.(91)

One of Dunnigan's major disputes with Barnett involved her efforts to become the first black woman reporter to travel with a United States President. Dunnigan's motivation was political as well as professional. She wanted the Democrats to remain in the White House, and she believed the image of a woman of her race traveling with President Truman would help him win the black vote from Progressive Henry Wallace.(92) But Barnett opposed Dunnigan traveling with Truman. He later told her: "I did not think a woman could do the best job on a jaunt of that kind."(93)

Determined and resourceful, Dunnigan cut the expenses to the bone and secured a $500 personal loan to finance her trip,(94) even though it took her a year to repay the money.(95)

Dunnigan also clearly exhibited the most common trait among pioneering women journalists--tenacity. To succeed despite prejudice against them, women journalists have been required to possess much more than talent. They also have had to be persistent and aggressive.(96) Through early battles with poverty, prejudice, low self-esteem, and difficulties in her personal life, Dunnigan developed strengths and resources that she later was able to call upon during her reporting career.

One unpleasant incident occurred during the 1948 Truman campaign trip. In Cheyenne, Wyoming, transportation had not been provided for the press corps. So when the president left the train, the sixty reporters began walking behind the motorcade, for which the street had been blocked off. Dunnigan, wearing a press badge three inches in diameter, was the only woman and the only black in the press corps that day. Suddenly a military police officer stepped forward and grabbed her, yelling: "Get back there behind those ropes!" Dunnigan boldly walked forward, refusing to comply with the order. The soldier grabbed Dunnigan and shoved her toward the edge of the street. Again she continued to walk forward. Only when a male reporter came to Dunnigan's rescue did the officer back away.(97)

Dunnigan's strength was tested over a much longer period of time through a highly publicized battle with President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the only Republican president she ever covered. During White House press conferences, she consistently raised issues of interest to African-Americans. In a front-page interview with The Washington Post in 1977, Dunnigan recalled: "I always felt a journalist should be a crusader. I went to every press conference with a loaded question. And if I got an answer or a 'no comment' or nothing, I had a story."(98)

Her confrontation with Eisenhower involved Dunnigan's belief that the United States Bureau of Engraving and Printing was discriminating against black job applicants. So during the April 29, 1954, White House press conference, Dunnigan asked President Eisenhower what his administration was doing to change the situation. In a clipped tone, Eisenhower retorted: "Have you gone to the proper departments of government to ask that question? I mean, have you gone to the Bureau of Engraving, and have you gone to the Civil Service Commission and asked that question?" Dunnigan began to respond: "I haven't asked the question, but I understood--" But Eisenhower cut her off, saying: "I like to come here completely prepared as well as I can to answer the questions that come up; but when you ask me about the details of how some particular thing has been handled, I can't be expected, I think, to know too much about it."(99)

After the confrontation, Eisenhower boycotted Dunnigan, even though she sometimes jumped to her feet as many as fifteen times during a single news conference.(100) During the first fifteen months of his presidency that preceded the incident (February 1953 through April 1954), Eisenhower had called on Dunnigan seven times; in the eighty-one months after the incident (May 1954 through January 1961), he called on Dunnigan only three times.(101) The frequency at which he called on Dunnigan had dropped from once every two months to once every twenty-seven months.(102)

Dunnigan was not a woman who liked to be ignored--even if the person attempting to do so was the President of the United States. Refusing to sit passively, she enlisted her fellow journalists--white as well as black--into a crusade against Eisenhower.(103) Strong words also came from Dunnigan. One of her stories read:

> White House press conferences have become a forum for the favorite few. The old spirit of democracy and fair play has vanished and only the privileged characters are putting on the show. . . .
>
> This is something which should be protested by that group of people who threw their weight behind Mr. Eisenhower and forrested (sic) him to the White House.(104)

Dunnigan did not succeed in forcing Eisenhower to respond to her questions, but her tenacity certainly turned the boycott into a journalistic and political issue. Eisenhower's avoidance of Dunnigan was so widely noted that it prompted press attention when President John F. Kennedy recognized Dunnigan at his first news conference.(105)

Dunnigan also demonstrated her tenacity when she broke the color barrier of Washington's professional organization for women journalists. In 1947, Elizabeth May Craig(106) asked Dunnigan if she would like to join the Women's National Press Club.(107) Dunnigan was eager to join, but she was not well known among the veteran newswomen. So Craig invited Dunnigan to a dinner party at her home. Guests included prominent women from the Washington press corps as well as Senator Margaret Chase Smith. Dunnigan recalled that she hardly said a word the whole evening and that, after that evening, Craig never again suggested that she join the club.(108) But Dunnigan remained determined to integrate the organization that continued to grow in size and prestige during the late 1940s and early 1950s.(109) In 1955 Dunnigan was officially nominated for membership.(110) Her nomination was unanimously accepted, and she became the group's first African-American member.(111) In 1983, Dunnigan wrote about her experience with the club in a magazine article. Dunnigan died later that year, making the article the last work she ever published. Dunnigan wrote with a tone of petulance:

> It took seven years from the time this idea of integration was first advanced until it reached fruition. Seven years that the standard bearer had to live in the shadow of rejection by fellow journalists. Existing for seven years wrapped in sackcloth of racial humiliation. . . . Seven years of waiting for professional liberals to decide whether they could, in good faith, accept just one minority member into their sacred society.(112)

With regard to writing, Dunnigan's work was in keeping with the tradition of many women journalists adopting a humanistic and reform-oriented approach.(113) Consistent with this tradition, Dunnigan illuminated instances of discrimination against

African-Americans. She wrote graphic, hard-hitting stories that documented injustices and made black people across the country aware that such injustices were taking place. Dunnigan investigated, uncovered, and reported numerous incidents, many of which the mainstream press ignored. In 1948, for example, Dunnigan reported that a six-foot cross fashioned in the form of a Ku Klux Klan warning had been burned in a vacant lot in Northeast Washington.(114) Neither The Washington Post nor the Washington Star reported the incident.(115)

Dunnigan's most important crusade against racial injustice involved Rosa Lee Ingram, a Georgia widow and mother of twelve children. In 1947, Ingram's mule and hogs strayed onto adjoining property farmed by a white sharecropper. Ingram and her three oldest sons went onto the man's property to retrieve the livestock, and the man met them with a rifle. When the sharecropper bloodied Ingram's head and shoulders with the butt of his rifle, her sons came to their mother's defense and killed the man. Ingram and her two oldest sons, aged seventeen and fourteen, were found guilty of first-degree murder and were sentenced to be executed.(116)

When word of the case reached the North, half a dozen concerned women traveled to Georgia to investigate. Dunnigan joined them, and her series of articles revealed several shocking details: The Ingrams had been held without bail for three months and had been convicted in a one-day trial before an all-white jury.(117) Many local residents believed that the sixty-six-year-old sharecropper had been enraged not as much by the trespassing livestock as by the forty-year-old Ingram's rejection of his sexual advances.(118) Local law enforcement officials had jailed the Ingrams immediately after the incident, making no provisions for the smaller children who ranged in age from eleven years to seventeen months.(119)

While Dunnigan was reporting these facts in the black press, mainstream newspapers virtually ignored the story. The Atlanta Constitution ran one six-inch article on its back page immediately after the sharecropper's death.(120) There is no way to assess Dunnigan's impact on the outcome of the case, but Ingram's sentence was reduced from execution to life imprisonment. She later was released on parole and her full political rights were restored.(121)

Dunnigan's articles also included many examples of the tradition of women journalists writing stories that carry an emotional intensity. This strength has been a topic in all the major histories of women in journalism.(122) When Dunnigan wrote about injustices, she demonstrated such an ability to create strong emotional reactions in her readers. Her stories often included poignant description. For example, one of her stories about Ingram sketched this scene:

> It was while Mrs. Ingram sat there pleading with this group of women to please try to obtain her freedom that Mrs. Eloise Stafford, a white Virginian who is now residing in Atlanta, burst in (sic) tears as though the weight of injustices done colored people by her southern forefathers now rested

> upon her shoulders. Tears streamed down the cheeks of some members of the delgation (sic), others dabbed their eyes with their handkerchiefs.(123)

Alice Allison Dunnigan does not rank among the most gifted or the most influential figures in the history of American journalism. Nevertheless, her life and contributions are of no minor consequence. For the study of Dunnigan's journalistic experiences and accomplishments provides a glimpse of a minority too long neglected by journalism scholars: the African-American woman. Through examining Alice Dunnigan's life and work, students of journalism history learn that African-American women journalists were not absent from the evolution of American journalism. Black women journalists have had a presence.

Dunnigan proved that a black newswoman could--at her will, with dignity, and without shame--roam the United States Capitol, the White House, the United States Department of State, and the United States Supreme Court. She also was the first journalist of her race and gender to demand the right to question the President of the United States about issues that affected the lives of her people. By opening the doors of this nation's most influential institutions, Dunnigan forced this nation and its highest officials to acknowledge that black Americans were not second-class citizens who would be satisfied with second-hand news.

Dunnigan also served her people and her nation by helping to push civil rights onto this country's national agenda. She chronicled the advances of the early leaders of the civil rights movement; she documented cases of injustices and then she pushed those injustices into the faces of her readers. For two centuries, African-Americans have had to fight for consideration, recognition, and respectability. Dunnigan was part of the black press that fearlessly has recorded these conflicts . . . and that will continue to express outrage until all such battles have been won.

This is not to say that Dunnigan was a pivotal figure in American journalism. To do so would be to glorify Dunnigan unduly. Her hand alone did not change American history. Her work did not signal any major trend in the evolution of American journalism. Her words were not read by millions, and she was not one of the most talented writers in the history of this country's news media. But she did make contributions. Unfortunately, the scholarship regarding African-American women journalists is so scant that it is impossible to place Dunnigan's accomplishments precisely in the context of her race and gender. For to study the journalistic career of any black woman is to break new ground. It can be confirmed that Dunnigan's work may not have been of the magnitude of that of Ida B. Wells-Barnett. But, beyond that, Dunnigan's place among African-American women journalists is unclear.

For more than a decade, historians examining the contributions of women journalists have been calling for more research on the lives and accomplishments of black women journalists.(124) These scholars also have provided brief sketches of women who could be examined in a book focusing on the black woman journalist's experience.(125) As such studies are completed, journalism historians will be better able to determine to what extent the experiences of black women journalists are different from those of their white colleagues. Dunnigan's experiences suggest that such differences may include a stronger likelihood that they have the opportunity to cover major news stories, that their reporting skills may be stronger than their writing skills, and that they tend to enter the field when they are older and at a more advanced stage in their lives. But further research on the life and journalistic work of other African-American women is necessary to determine if these differences were common among them, and, if so, to enrich the understanding of why such differences have been so pervasive.

Regardless of these differences or of Dunnigan's position compared to that of other African-American women journalists, however, this granddaughter of slaves is a subject worthy of recognition, examination, and emulation. For, through Alice Allison Dunnigan, students of American journalism history are assured that the African-American woman was present--not as a passive witness, but as an active participant.

---

[1] The lack of recognition of black women journalists has been acknowledged for more than a century. In an 1889 magazine article about women journalists, the author observed that the contributions of black women journalists had not been adequately recorded. Lucy Wilmot Smith, "Woman's Number," The Journalist, vol. VII, 26 January 1889, p. 4. Also see Maurine Beasley and Sheila Silver, Women in Media: Documentary Source Book (Washington, D.C.: Women's Institute for Freedom of the Press, 1977), pp. vii and 20.

[2] Edwin Emery and Michael Emery, The Press and America: An Interpretive History of the Mass Media, 5th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1984), p. 307.

[3] For information on Wells-Barnett, see her autobiography, Crusade for Justice (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), edited by her daughter, Alfreda M. Duster. Other sources describing Wells-Barnett's accomplishments include Ronald E. Wolseley's The Black Press, USA (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1971), pp. 28-29, and Beasley and Silver, pp. 38-39. Dunnigan mentioned Wells-Barnett in "Early History of Negro Women in Journalism," Negro History Bulletin, vol. 28, May 1965, pp. 178-79, 193, 197.

[4] Ishbel Ross, Ladies of the Press (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1936).

[5] Marion Marzolf, Up From the Footnote: A History of Women Journalists (New York: Hastings House, 1977), pp. 25-26.

[6] Kay Mills, A Place in the News: From the Women's Pages to the Front Page (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1988), pp. 27-28, 174-96.

[7] Emery and Emery does not mention Dunnigan. Neither Ross nor Marzolf mentions Dunnigan, and Mills states only that Dunnigan was one of the women reporters banned from the National Press Club floor and relegated to its balcony.

[8] Another source that provides glimpses into the life and experiences of a black woman journalist is Jean E. Collins, She Was There: Stories of Pioneering Women Journalists (New York: Julian Messner, 1980). The fifteen first-person accounts in the book include one by Hazel Garland. Garland joined the Pittsburgh Courier staff in 1946. She became city editor in 1972 and editor-in-chief in 1974. Although the book takes a narrative approach rather than a scholarly approach, Garland's account is relevant because she, like Dunnigan, is a black woman who worked in the black press in the 1940s and 1950s.

9 The national news agency was founded by Claude A. Barnett, a reporter for the Chicago Defender, in 1919. ANP's goal was to provide the black community of the United States and African nations with news of domestic and international events involving or relevant to African-Americans. At its peak in the 1940s, ANP served 112 newspapers. Black press scholars have estimated that ANP members accounted for 90 percent of the total circulation of the country's black newspapers. Members paid a monthly fee for ANP stories, in addition to providing the service with major news stories that took place in their community. ANP, which was based in Chicago, opened a Washington office during World War II. The Associated Negro Press ceased operation in 1964. Two sources that provide a history of ANP are Lawrence Hogan, A Black National News Service: The Associated Negro Press and Claude Barnett, 1919-1945 (Cranbury, N.J.: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1984) and Richard Beard and Cyril Zoerner, "The Associated Negro Press: Its Founding, Ascendancy, and Demise," Journalism Quarterly, vol. 46 (Spring 1969): pp. 47-52.

10 Jane Grey Swisshelm had become the first woman admitted to the gallery a century earlier when Horace Greeley engaged her as a Washington correspondent for the New York Tribune in 1850, according to Beasley and Silver, p. 8.

11 Several black magazines and newspapers recorded Dunnigan's breakthroughs soon after she had achieved them. See, for example, Our World, "Washington Reporter," February 1947, p. 18; Louisville Leader, "Admit Woman to Press Galleries," 5 July 1947, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society; Pulse, "Alice A. Dunnigan," November 1947, pp. 18-19; Opportunity, "White House Reporter," Spring 1948, p. 52. Other publications that described Dunnigan's early achievements in articles that were published near the end of her career include the Russellville (Kentucky) News-Democrat, "A Teenager Who Didn't Drop Out Despite Hardship," 19 March 1964, p. 2; Washington Press, "Prominent Newspaper Woman Appointed To High Political Post," 30 June 1961, p. 1.

12 A primary source for this paper was the Alice Allison Dunnigan Papers held at the Moorland-Spingarn Research Center at Howard University. The papers comprise twenty boxes of materials Dunnigan deposited at the center in 1977. Of particular interest are the clippings of Dunnigan's newspaper articles. These clippings are important because most of the Associated Negro Press newspapers for which Dunnigan wrote have not been preserved. Only five ANP newspapers are available for the 1940s and 1950s through the Library of Congress--the Atlanta Daily World, Baltimore Afro-American, (Norfolk, Virginia) Journal & Guide, Philadelphia Tribune, and Washington Afro-American; only two ANP newspapers are available for the period through the Black Press Archives at Howard University--the Pittsburgh Courier and Washington Afro-American. Because Dunnigan wrote for more than 100 additional newspapers, many of her articles are available only through the clippings in the Alice Allison Dunnigan Papers.

13 Dunnigan reported fulltime from 1947 to 1961. In the 1960s and 1970s, she was employed by the federal government. While working fulltime for the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and, later, the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, she continued to work part time as a newspaper columnist.

14 Ross, p. 2.

15 Mills, p. 65. Also see Mills, pp. 81-83.

16 Marzolf, pp. 90-92. For more examples of women journalists not being allowed to cover hard news, see Beasley and Silver, pp. 45, 47, 62, 138-39.

17 Garland also covered hard news in the black press. See Collins, pp. 114-17.

18 Alice A. Dunnigan, "Liberals March In D.C., Seek Action," Atlanta Daily World, 5 January 1947, p. 1.

19 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "Clerics Pray on Capitol Steps as Congress Opens," Washington Afro-American, 10 January 1948, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Miss. Solons Set to Fight Lynch Bill," Washington Afro-American, 31 January 1948, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Taylor Asks Action on 2 'Rights' Bills," Washington Afro-American, 7 February 1948, p. 4; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Republicans in Congress Push Civil Rights Bills, Journal & Guide, 24 January 1948, p. 4; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Congress Nears End Without Laws To Aid Average Americans," Atlanta Daily World, 2 June 1948, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Which Shall It Be--Anti-Lynch or FEPC?," Atlanta Daily World, 4 January 1950, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Senate Kills FEPC Bill; Cloture 12 Votes Short," (Columbia, S.C.) Informer, 27 May 1950, p. 3.

20 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "Supreme Court Issues 90-day Stay in McGhee Death Sentence," Black Dispatch, 5 August 1950, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "'Separate But Equal' Doctrine Gutted by U.S. Supreme Court, (Oklahoma City) Black Dispatch, p. 1. (This article described the Brown vs. Board of Education decision delivered by the U.S. Supreme Court on May 17, 1954, and was published soon after that date. The specific page and date, however, are not known. When Dunnigan clipped her articles from the newspapers in which they appeared, she did not always cite the publication or date. Originals of most of her clipped articles were found in the five ANP newspapers preserved at the Library of Congress or the two at Howard University, but this one was not. The only known source for this article, then, is the Alice Allison Dunnigan Papers. With this article, as with several others cited in this paper, the specific box containing the article will be identified. This story is in Box 5.)

21 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "Truman Silent on Pearson's Allegation He Insults Race," Washington Afro-American, 27 March 1948, p. 26; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Colored Mayor Of Boys' Town Gives Truman Gift," Journal & Guide, 12 June 1948, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Good Will Shown on Truman Tour," Baltimore Afro-American, 3 July 1948, p. 5.

22 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "Fairness to All Pledged by New VA Administrator," Washington Afro-American, 10 January 1948, p. 3; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Air Chiefs Study Plan To Change Status Of Fliers," Journal & Guide, 19 June 1948, p.1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Army Jimcrow May End Under Truman?," Indianapolis Recorder, 13 November 1948, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Powell's Charge Against Defense Dept. Denied by Pentagon Chiefs," Atlanta Daily World, 20 February 1950, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Negro U.S. American Crewmen Forced to Submit to South Africa's Segregation Rules," Black Dispatch, 5 February 1955, p. 1.

23 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "Haitian Official Insulted in Miss.," Philadelphia Tribune, 18 November 1947, p. 16; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Paul Robeson's Passports Voided by State Department in Sudden Move by U.S.," Black Dispatch, 12 August 1950, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "U.S. Apologizes for J. Crow Insult to Nigerian Official," (Oklahoma City) Black Dispatch, Alice Allison Dunnigan Papers, Box 16.

24 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "FCC Urged To Punish WFOR To Limit of Law," Journal & Guide, 27 December 1947, p.1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "'Security' Loan Campaign Backed," Washington Afro-American, 3 April 1948, p. 4; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Negroes Now Own 14 Banks," Pittsburgh Courier, 30 October 1948, p. 27.

25 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "Charge Girl Is Barred From School Due To Color," Washington Afro-American, 18 October 1947, p. 2; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Covenanters Seek to Evict Family," Washington Afro-American, 3 April 1948, p. 2; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Found Guilty Of Manslaughter, Man Gets Twenty Years," Atlanta Daily World, 23 June 1948, p. 1.

26 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "Truman Hits Jack Pot In Los Angeles Rights Plea," Atlanta Daily World, 23 June 1948, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Veterans' Rally Told Louis Is With Robeson," Washington Afro-American, 3 July 1948, p. 5; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Republican Party Claims It Is Still on Civil Rights Band Wagon," Atlanta Daily World, 12 January 1950, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Dixiecrats Rumor Dawson to Run for Vice President of U.S.," Black Dispatch, 29 April 1950, p. 1.

27 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "17 Land Grant College Heads Hit Dixie Plan," Pittsburgh Courier, 30 October 1948, p. 15; Alice A. Dunnigan, "100th Anniversary Of Higher Education For Negroes in U.S.," Informer, 7 May 1949, p. 2.

28 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "Dems Employ Many Negroes in 'Integrated' Quarters," Ohio Daily Express, 4 October 1948, p. 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Negroes Line Up In Limited Numbers On Subcommittees of President Truman's Inaugural Committee," Black Dispatch, 22 January 1949, 1; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Three Negro Lobbyist (sic) in Washington, The Capital," Fort Worth Defender, 21 December 1950, p. 406.

29 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "Churchmen Plan to Fight Dixie Governors' Hate," Washington Afro-American, 28 February 1948, p. 21; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Child's Cafe Serves 200 in Mixed Group," Washington Afro-American, 14 August 1948, p. 3; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Find Long-Lost DC Anti-Bias Law," New York Amsterdam News, 28 May 1949, p. 6; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Groups Plan Nat'l Civil Rights Mobilization Drive," Atlanta Daily World, 1 January 1950, p. 2; Alice A. Dunnigan, "750 Voteless Citizens Jam-Pack Office Building," Dallas Star Post, 8 August 1959, p. 1.

30 See, for example, Alice A. Dunnigan, "Pass Buck On Jim Crow," Kansas City Call, 21 May 1948, p. 2; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Southern Supremacy Reaches Point of Stupidity; Can't Tell Races Apart," Ohio Daily Express, 26 March 1948, p. 3; Alice A. Dunnigan, "Covering Washington," Black Dispatch, 5 March 1955, Alice Allison Dunnigan Papers, Box 16.

31 Alice A. Dunnigan, "Secret Paper Studies Negro in New War," Philadelphia Tribune, 11 November 1947, p. 1. Truman abolished discrimination in the military through an executive order on July 26, 1948.

32 Alice A. Dunnigan, "Hits Brutality on Women By Washington, D.C. Cops," Alice Allison Dunnigan Papers, Box 3.

33 Alice A. Dunnigan, "New York Delegation Causes D.C. Hotel To Break Down 'No Negro' Policy," Informer, 29 January 1949, p. 3.

34 Alice A. Dunnigan, "7,500 'March' On Washington," Atlanta Daily World, 6 June 1948, p. 1.

35 Alice A. Dunnigan, "Pajama Clad Truman from Platform Re-Iterates His Belief In Civil Rights." This article was published during June 1948, but the specific newspaper and exact date and page number are not known. A clipping of the article is contained in the Alice Allison Dunnigan Papers, Box 3.

36 Emery and Emery, p. 306.

37 Armistead Scott Pride, "Negro Newspapers: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow," Journalism Quarterly, vol. XXVIII (Spring 1951), pp. 181-82.

38 Ibid., p. 179.

39 ANP's expenses exceeded subscription revenue for every mailing distributed during the news service's forty-five-year history, with a single mailing sometimes costing ANP as much as $3,000 more than subscribers paid for it. In 1951, the continuing financial difficulties forced ANP to reduce its mailings and narrow its focus to the independence movements in Africa. Fiscal problems finally forced ANP to cease operation in 1964. For a full discussion of ANP's finances, see Beard and Zoerner, p. 49; Hogan, pp. 234-35.

40 See, for example, letters written by Alice A. Dunnigan to Claude A. Barnett, 6 January 1948, 21 June 1948, and an undated letter the contents of which identify it as having been written early in 1948, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

41 Letter written by Alice A. Dunnigan to Claude A. Barnett, 8 September 1948, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

42 Letter written by Alice A. Dunnigan to Claude A. Barnett, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society. The letter is undated, but its contents identify it as having been written early in 1948.

43 Dunnigan described these incidents and her feelings of inferiority in her autobiography, A Black Woman's Experience: From Schoolhouse to White House (Philadelphia: Dorrance & Co., 1974), p. 32.

44 A Black Woman's Experience, p. 43.

45 Dunnigan discussed her father's feelings in an interview conducted with her on April 8, 1977 as part of the Black Women Oral History Project undertaken by the Schlesinger Library at Radcliffe College. The project was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, and the interview was conducted by Marcia Greenlee. A transcript of the interview is held in the Washingtoniana Collection at Martin Luther King Junior Memorial Library in Washington, D.C. Dunnigan's comments about her father's attitude toward her education are found on p. 4 of the transcript.

46 A Black Woman's Experience, p. 28.

47 Letter written by Alice A. Dunnigan to Claude A. Barnett, 8 February 1947, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

48 Dunnigan's Kentucky newspaper experience included being social editor of the Louisville Leader, reporter and columnist for the Louisville Defender, reporter for the Owensboro Enterprise, and co-editor of the Informer in Louisville. See Louisville Leader, "Admit Woman to Press Galleries," 5 July 1947, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

49 Garland also placed reaching her career goal above the size of her paycheck. Collins, pp. 107-08.

50 A Black Woman's Experience, p. 205.

51 According to the 1950 U.S. Census, in 1949 black men in the District of Columbia earned an average salary of $2,182 a year. Most black black women also made more money than Dunnigan did. In 1949 black women in the District of Columbia earned an average salary of $1,395 a year. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1950, Volume II: Characteristics of the Population (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1952), p. 9-101.

52 Letter written by Alice A. Dunnigan to Frank Marshall Davis, 26 May 1947, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

53 Letter written by Alice A. Dunnigan to Claude A. Barnett, 8 February 1947, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

54 See, for example, Ross, p. 4; Marzolf, pp. 32-3, 37, 39; Mills, pp. 19, 27, 74, 75-76; Collins, 52-53, 63, 85, 93.

55 See letter written by Claude A. Barnett to Alice A. Dunnigan, 26 August 1947, 21 June 1948, 7 August 1948, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

56 Letter written by Claude A. Barnett to Alice A. Dunnigan, 7 August 1948, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

57 See, for examples, letters written by Frank Marshall Davis to Alice A. Dunnigan, 29 April 1947, 20 May 1947, 30 July 1947, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

58 Letter written by Claude A. Barnett to Alice A. Dunnigan, 22 February 1947, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

59 Alice A. Dunnigan, "17 Land Grant College Heads Hit Dixie Plan," Pittsburgh Courier, 30 October 1948, p. 15.

60 Alice A. Dunnigan, "Miss. Solons Set to Fight Lynch Bill," Washington Afro-American, 31 January 1948, p. 1.

61 Alice A. Dunnigan, "Mrs. Ingram Receives Guests," Washington Afro-American, 23 April, 1949, p. 2.

62 See Collins, p. 103.

63 Garland's father, like Dunnigan's, tried to dissuade her from obtaining an education, Collins, p. 104.

64 Dunnigan describes these barriers to her education in a letter she wrote to John Hein, her boss at the President's Council on Youth Opportunity on October 31, 1969. The letter is contained in Box 2 of the Alice Allison Dunnigan Papers.

65 In one home economics course, Dunnigan did nothing except bake banana pies for herself, her roommate, her teacher, and the president of the college. Black Women Oral History Project, p. 9.

66 Black Women Oral History Project, p. 8.

67 Henry G. La Brie III and William J. Zima, "Directional Quandries of the Black Press in the United States," Journalism Quarterly 48 (Winter 1971), p. 640. For additional discussion of the poor editorial quality of the black press, see, for example, Maxwell R. Brooks, The Negro Press Re-Examined (Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1959), pp. 23-25; Editor & Publisher 101, 29 June 1968, p. 19; Robert Finkelstein in Race and the News Media, Paul L. Fisher and Ralph L. Lowenstein, eds. (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967), pp. 123, 139; Carlton B. Goodlett, "The Black Press: A Democratic Society's Catalytic Agent for Building Tomorrow's America," in Perspectives of the Black Press: 1974," Henry G. La Brie III, ed. (Kennebunkport, Maine: Mercer House Press, 1974), p. 210; Thomas A. Johnson, "A Graduate Of The Black Press Looks Back," in Perspectives of the Black Press: 1974, La Brie, p. 183; L.F. Palmer, Jr., "The black press in transition," Columbia Journalism Review, Spring 1970, pp. 32-33; Armistead Scott Pride, "Negro Newspapers: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow," Journalism Quarterly 28 (Spring 1951), pp. 181, 186; Wolseley, pp. 369-71, 381-84; Consuelo C. Young, "A Study of Reader Attitudes Toward the Negro Press," Journalism Quarterly 21 (June 1944), pp. 149-50.

68 Marzolf, pp. 23, 54, 85.

69 Ross, p. 12.

70 Garland was thirty-two years old when she began working full time for the Pittsburgh Courier. She was fifty-eight years old when she became city editor and sixty when she became editor-in-chief. See Collins, pp. 103, 104, 109.

71 See, for example, Marzolf, p. 85; Beasley and Silver, pp. 48, 67; Maurine H. Beasley, Eleanor Roosevelt and the Media: A Public Quest for Self-Fulfillment (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1987), p. 108.

72 Black Women Oral History Project, pp. 12, 16.

73 "Washington Reporter," Our World, February, 1949, p. 18.

74 A Black Woman's Experience, p. 21.

75 Black Women Oral History Project, p. 7.

76 When Dunnigan began teaching in 1924, her annual salary was $500; in that year nationwide, the average teaching salary was $1,227. When Dunnigan left teaching in 1942, her annual salary was $800; in that year nationwide, the average teaching salary was $1,507. See Dunnigan letter to John Hein, October 31, 1969, p. 3; _Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970_ (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 375.

77 Garland worked as a domestic when no other jobs were available.

78 _A Black Woman's Experience_, pp. 161-63.

79 Black Women Oral History Project, p. 12; _A Black Woman's Experience_, p. 182.

80 _Ibid._

81 Author's interview with Robert Dunnigan, 28 October 1989.

82 _A Black Woman's Experience_, pp. 161-63.

83 Black Women Oral History Project, pp. 27-28.

84 _A Black Woman's Experience_, p. 204.

85 See, for example, Ross, pp. xi, 2, 5, 13; Marzolf, pp. ix, 14, 32-3, 39, 44, 74-75, 85; Mills, pp. 19, 65; Beasley and Silver, pp. 45, 67; Collins, 15, 109, 179, 184.

86 _A Black Woman's Experience_, p. 287.

87 Letter written by Claude A. Barnett to Alice A. Dunnigan, 28 January 1948, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

88 Letter written by Alice A. Dunnigan to Claude A. Barnett, 30 January 1948, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

89 See letter written by Claude A. Barnett to Reid E. Jackson, 2 March 1946, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

90 James H. Baker reiterated the financial details of Barnett's job offer to Baker in a letter dated 18 December 1946. Barnett confirmed those details in a letter dated 31 December 1946. Both letters are in the Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

91 Letter written by Alice A. Dunnigan to Claude A. Barnett, 30 January 1948, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

92 Alice A. Dunnigan letter to President Harry S. Truman, March 29, 1949 (enclosure number 1), Harry S. Truman Library.

93 Letter written by Claude A. Barnett to Alice A. Dunnigan, 7 August 1948, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society. Barnett's opposition also may have been influenced by his own political leanings. Barnett ran the Republican Party's publicity campaign for the black vote in the 1920s and 1930s, using Republican Party stationery in the ANP office. During this period, ANP was a Republican Party organ. Barnett and ANP broke all political ties in 1936, but his Republican leanings still may have influenced his decision regarding Dunnigan's effort to support the Democratic Party. See Beard and Zoerner, p. 49.

94 Dunnigan letter to Truman, March 29, 1949 (enclosure number 1).

95 Letter written by Alice A. Dunnigan to Claude A. Barnett, 25 June 1948, Claude A. Barnett Papers, Chicago Historical Society.

96 See, for example, Ross, pp. xi, 9; Marzolf, p. 81; Beasley and Silver, p. 44; Collins, pp. 79, 109, 131, 177, 183.

97 Alice A. Dunnigan, "Prejudiced MP Given Reprimand for Bias," Washington Afro-American, 19 June 1948, p. 3. Two days after the incident, Dunnigan was in her railroad compartment typing a story, with her bare feet propped up on the opposite seat and the typewriter on her lap. After a tap at the door, in stepped President Truman. Dunnigan tried to stand, but she could not move because the typewriter was across her lap. So there she sat with her bare toes sticking up as she bounced up and down on the seat, making a futile attempt to stand. "I didn't know what to do," Dunnigan said when recounting the moment. "I tugged at my skirt. I couldn't find my shoes. I knew I should be standing up, but I couldn't move. Then President Truman said, very quietly, 'I heard you had a little trouble. Well, if anything else happens, please let me know.'" Jacqueline Trescott, The Washington Post, "The Black Press: New Archive for An Embattled, Battling Institution," 18 March 1977, p. 1.

98 Trescott, p. 1.

99 Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1954 (Washington, D.C.: Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, 1960), pp. 92-93. Two months later, Eisenhower had a similar interchange with the only other black woman in the press corps. When Ethel L. Payne, who came to Washington for the Chicago Defender in 1953, asked Eisenhower if his administration supported passing a law to ban segregation in interstate travel,

the president insisted that the administration's support was not needed. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, pp. 623-24.

100 A Black Woman's Experience, p. 379.

101 Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

102 Eisenhower also boycotted Payne. During the seventeen months of his presidency that preceded the interchange with Payne (February 1953 through June 1954), Eisenhower had called on Payne six times; in the seventy-nine months after the incident (August 1954 through January 1961), he called on Payne only two times. (Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.) The frequency at which he called on Payne had dropped from once every three months to once every forty months.

103 See, for example, Murray Kempton, "The Label We Bear," New York Post, 19 April 1957, p. M4; Labor's Daily, "Negro Reporters Protest Snubs at Ike Conferences," 21 May 1957, p. 10.

104 Alice A. Dunnigan, The Black Dispatch, 17 May 1957, "Woman Reporter Declares Partiality Is Shown at White House Press Conferences," p. 1.

105 Jet, 9 February 1961, "Kennedy In, Negro Reporter Gets First Answer in Two Years," p. 6.

106 Craig was a veteran newswoman who wrote for Maine newspapers and appeared frequently on "Meet the Press." She also had marched in a suffragist parade and had become the first woman to fly over the North Pole. Murray Ilson, "May Craig Feisty Capital Writer, Dies," New York Times, 16 July 1975, p. 40.

107 It should be noted that Dunnigan's statements are the only documentation for these events. An examination of the Elizabeth May Craig Papers at the Library of Congress produced no correspondence with or mention of Dunnigan. In general, Craig was a socially progressive woman. Her strong advocacy for the integration of the Congressional Press Galleries in the early 1940s, she believed, was the reason that she was defeated in her first effort to be elected to the Standing Committee of Correspondents. (See Elizabeth May Craig Papers, Box 1, unpublished manuscript.)

108 For a full history of the Women's National Press Club, see Maurine H. Beasley, "The Women's National Press Club: Case Study of Professional Aspirations," Journalism History 15 (Winter 1988), pp. 112-21.

109 Beasley, "The Women's National Press Club," p. 117.

110 (Washington) Evening Star, "Negro Seeks to Join Women's Press Club," 8 March 1955, p. C-4.

111 The minutes of the Women's National Press Club for March 9, 1955, indicate that Dunnigan was admitted on March 1, 1955. Those minutes are held at the National Press Club Archives at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C.

112 Alice A. Dunnigan, "Reminiscence: How the Washington Press Club Became Integrated," Washington Living, March 1983, p. 10.

113 Anne Royall may have been the first American woman journalist to fight human injustice. Early in the nineteenth century Royall used her Washington newspaper to support the causes of American Indians and immigrants. See Marzolf, p. 11. For other examples of women journalists crusading for reform, see Marzolf, pp. 13, 14-15; Mills, pp. 19, 24, 30, 31; Collins, pp. 110-11, 141, 161; Beasley and Silver pp. 8, 15, 29, 38, 47 54-62, 63.

114 Alice A. Dunnigan, "Veterans Put Out Six-Foot Burning Cross in NE Area," Washington Afro-American, 3 April 1948, p. 1.

115 No coverage of the incident appeared in the Post or Star during the two weeks before or after Dunnigan's story appeared, March 24 through April 10, 1948.

116 Alice A. Dunnigan, "Mrs. Ingram Receives Guests," Washington Afro-American, 23 April 1949, p. 2.

117 Ibid.

118 Ibid.

119 Ibid.

120 Atlanta Constitution, "Woman, 5 Sons Held in Slaying Of Schley Farmer," Nov. 5, 1947, p. 20.

121 A Black Woman's Experience, p. 275.

122 See, for example, Ross, p. 4; Marzolf, pp. 32, 34, 35, 37; Mills, pp. 27, 70, 74, 183; Collins, pp. 52, 67, 119. Also see Ralph Martin, Cissy (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979), p. 338. It was women journalists' success at appealing to the emotions that led to the "sob sisters." These women, the most famous of whom was Winifred Black Bonfils (Annie Laurie), were granted front-row seats at trials in order that they could spot the "tear-filled eye," "quivering lip," "lump in the throat," and "trembling hand."

123 Alice A. Dunnigan, "Mrs. Ingram Receives Guests," Washington Afro-American, 23 April 1949, p. 2.

124 See, for example, Beasley and Silver, p. viii; Mills, p. 176.

125 Beasley and Silver mentioned, for example, Gertrude E. H. Bustill Mossell, Lucretia Newman-Coleman, Victoria Earle Mathews, Lillian Alberta Lewis, and Ione E. Wood. Mills mentioned Marvel Cooke of the Compass in New York City and Ethel L. Payne of the Chicago Defender. Other nineteenth and twentieth century African-American women whose contributions could be documented include Mary Ann Shadd Cary of Canada's Provincial Freeman, Delilah L. Beasley of the Oakland Tribune, Lucile Bluford of the Kansas City Call, Hazel Garland of the Pittsburgh Courier, Dorothy Gilliam of The Washington Post, Nancy Hicks Maynard of The New York Times, Bea Hines of The Miami Herald, and Charlayne Hunter-Gault of The New York Times and "MacNeil/Lehrer Report."

Peter Parisi
Humanities Division
Penn State Harrisburg
U.S. Route 230
Middletown, Pa. 17057
(717) 948-6203 (Work)
(717) 236-4229 (Home)

Lincoln Steffens and The Commercial Advertiser*

For all the connotations of superficiality and venality that sometimes attach to its name, American journalism is animated by a powerful ideal: the belief that everyday experience and the lives of ordinary people are "newsworthy," that journalism can present an articulate account of the quality of daily life in a particular place.[1] When newspaper editors wax philosophic they say they want not just news of public events, but "the human stories," an account of "the way we live now"--conceptions that might befit a Balzac as readily as an Abe Rosenthal. And much as this journalistic idea may sound overambitious, it cannot be denied without also denying that even the most humble lives shade off into larger forces of history or express profound and moving dramas. If many artists have found their material in quotidian life, then so might journalists. And insofar as daily journalism attempts to register the quality of everyday experience, it necessarily becomes, in some measure, literary journalism.

*Research for this essay was carried out under a grant from the Capital College Research Fund of Penn State Harrisburg.

But in what measure? In what literary mode or genre?

The revolution in news values achieved by the Penny Press in the 1830s may have encouraged journalistic realism through an "appreciation of the news value of sentiment and humor of the daily life around us."[2] But too often, these feature writing conventions depict life as a cavalcade of novelty, oddity, sensation and sentiment, as melodrama.[3] Lincoln Steffens' tenure as city editor of The [New York] Commercial Advertiser from late 1897 to May 1901 is noteworthy in the history of literary journalism, especially as it might be conducted in the daily press, precisely because Steffens insisted that journalistic writing could register beauty rather than novelty, tragedy as readily as melodrama. Under his guidance (with crucial inspiration from Abraham Cahan), the "human story" took on richer and more complex dimensions. There have been "writer's papers" before and since, but it is doubtful that any American newspaper has ever adopted an artistic approach to the news as thoroughly and self-consciously as did The Commercial Advertiser. Steffens made literary journalism into editorial policy.

To fully appreciate his achievement, it is helpful to look more closely at the more typical approach to feature writing--the routine literary journalism of the daily press--which was consolidated with the rise of the Penny Press in the 1830s and persists to this day. This approach centers feature writing on the pursuit of novelty--the news as Man Bites Dog[4], a stance that fatefully limits the possible literary resonance of journalistic writing. Hutchins Hapgood, who developed his conception of literary journalism under Steffens at The Commercial Advertiser, mordantly described the effects of the journalist's ceaseless quest for novelty. It makes journalism, he said, into "the roue of literature." "Jaded with the exceptional, it seeks in vain for the fresh," impoverishing genuine imagination in the process.[5] Equally impoverished is the possibility of literary resonance and suggestiveness. As James Carey says of the journalism of Man Bites Dog: "Unfortunately, no one knows what possessed the man who bit the dog; even psychiatrists are not likely to be much help." In focusing on "the unusual, the nonroutine, the unexpected," Carey notes, news "necessarily highlights events that interest us precisely because they have no explanation. News of novel events must strain causality and credibility [italics added]."[6] But in defying explanation, the journalistic account of a novelty by extension also loses the evocativeness that is essential to that mode of symbolism we call "literature." The report of the astonishing event limits our responses to something like, "thank God it wasn't me!" or "Gosh, you never know what's going to happen, do you?" Sensationalism shocks--and thereby silences--the mind. Literature elicits contemplation. As Mitchell Stephens has put it more colloquially, "The artist experiments with our wiring; the journalist often just pushes the buttons."[7]

"Button-pushing" feature writing takes shape between the poles of fact and entertainment. Joseph Pulitzer ringed the newsroom of the New York World with signs urging reporters to gather "the facts, the color, the facts", but these primal forces of the commercial press exert a curious mutual influence. Pulitzer notwithstanding, when editors wax practical and "objective," they forget all about the color of "the way we live now." So Roger Rosenblatt, a senior writer at Time magazine, intones: "The business of journalism is to present facts accurately . . . . Those seeking something larger are advised to look elsewhere."[8] Not a word about a quality that pervades every story in the magazine where Rosenblatt labors only to present facts accurately--the desire to compose facts into a readable, even an astonishing, account.[9] But as a commercial product the newspaper must offer "a good read." The standard journalistic terms of praise for good writing are indicative of the narrow expressive range this journalism grants itself and the desire to amuse: it is "bright"; it has "color"; it "sparkles" or "sings." Explicitly defining their role as recorders of fact while covertly striving to entertain, journalists are easily tempted to find the occasion for good writing in odd and novel events. These appear to carry their power "in themselves." Conflict, personality, sentiment and humor become the keynotes of journalistic writing, the whole conveying a tone that Jacques Barzun has characterized as "solemn ritual clowning."[10]

When Steffens, after five years as a reporter on The Evening Post, set out to create a paper that would have "literary charm as well as daily information,"[11] he significantly shifted away from this approach to feature writing. As he described it in his Autobiography, and as the pages of The Commercial Advertiser bear out, Steffens young staff interpreted New York's daily life to evoke comprehension rather than astonishment and understanding rather than fear. They shifted the center of news from novelty to "the beauty in the mean streets of a hard, beautiful city,"[12] "the moving picture of what was happening in a city full of Italians, Jews, Chinese, Germans, French, rounders, slums, and palaces."[13] Steffens encouraged his reporters to seek in the social and human scene not the aberrant but the "typical," "characteristic" or "interesting." Instead of writing melodramas, they attempted, within the limits of daily journalism, to sketch tragic complexity and contradiction.

The move away from journalistic stereotype began in openness to the particularities of the city scene. The characteristic "try-out" at The Commercial Advertiser, for instance, was an exercise in a kind of journalistic imagism. The prospective reporter was to "go and see and write the difference between Fifth Avenue and Broadway or Thirty-sixth and Thirty-seventh Streets." This conception of "news" began, Steffens claimed, in "a love of New York, just as it was, and my ambition was to have it reported so that New Yorkers might see, not merely read of it, as it was: rich and poor, wicked and good, ugly but beautiful, growing, great."[14]

Newswriting in general was more "literary" in the 1890s than it is today,[15] but it had nonetheless become stereotypical enough that Steffens could define his editorial approach by contrast with the routine conceptions and formula writing of "the professional newspaper man."[16] He wanted instead reporters with "fresh staring eyes," adding, "When a reporter no longer saw red at a fire, when he was so used to police news that a murder was not a human tragedy but only a crime, he could not write police news for us."[17] A more capacious, particular journalism could only be expressed through the reporter's personal vision. But that, for Steffens, was tantamount to saying, ". . . writers were wanted--not newspaper men, but writers." ~~And~~ he fired the paper's existing staff and hired only college graduates who wanted to write.[18]

Steffens' challenged his staff "to beat the other papers only in the way they presented the news,"[19] but doing so entailed more than sensory detail. It called for an attempt to capture the larger resonance of events. An anecdote in Steffens' Autobiography nicely expresses the distinction between sensational and literary approaches to the same event. Having received "the flash of a murder," Steffens wrote, he would "without any urge" instruct his reporter as follows:

> "'Here, Cahan, is a report that a man has murdered his wife, a rather bloody, hacked-up crime. We don't care about that. But there's a story in it. That man loved that woman well enough once to marry her, and now he has hated her enough to cut her all to pieces. If you can find out just what happened between that wedding and this murder, you will have a novel for yourself and a short story for me. Go on now, take your time, and get this tragedy, as a tragedy.'

Steffens' anecdote mounts an implicit critique of conventional journalistic practice. "The flash of the murder" brings the appearance of the novelty that constitutes news, and, like any journalist Steffens says, "...There's a story in it." But for Steffens the story lies not in the front-page stuff of a "bloody, hacked-up crime," but in the underlying forces that lead to the killing, the process by which love can turn to murderous hatred. The news "story" is thus a "short story," even "a tragedy."

This approach to journalistic story-telling also aimed to evoke in the reader a deeper response than astonishment. "Our stated ideal for a murder story," Steffens wrote, "was that it should be so understood and told that the murderer would not be hanged, not by our readers." Steffens was not, let it be perfectly clear, launching a campaign against capital punishment. He was rather calling for newswriting that would elicit from the reader more open, and therefore, aesthetic, attention. Steffens crucial recognition was that it was not in "sparkling" prose that journalism gained literary power, but in offering an account of a news event that suggested its connections with larger patterns of individual and social life. A similar theme informed his criticism of the Evening Post's restrained coverage of crime: "The Post printed a murder, a mere mean murder, as news, and there was no news in it; only life."[20] The endeavor to portray the news event more fully linked the journalist and the artist: it was, Steffens insisted, "scientifically and artistically the true ideal for an artist and for a newspaper: to get the news so completely and to report it so humanly that the reader will see himself in the other fellow's place."[21]

Steffens' manifesto, composed some thirty years after the fact, was in fact realized in the pages of The Commercial Advertiser. But in practice, it was not so much the coverage of breaking news that distinguished The Commercial Advertiser's literary journalism as its portraits of the life of the city, most often published on the first page of the paper's second section on Saturdays.[22] The depth of these stories has been noticed by students of the journalism of the day. Moses Rischin, for instance, has praised the way Abraham Cahan's portraits of the Jews in The Commercial Advertiser evaded stereotype: "Here were objects neither of commiseration nor outrage, neither financial titans nor merchant princes, neither a mystical people nor a tenement proletariat, neither comics nor grotesques."[23] But that praise could be extended more generally. The The Commercial Advertiser's city coverage regularly displayed a remarkable ability to transform stereotypical journalistic categories. We can examine the paper's method even in minor feature stories, such as "Sad Common Sense," a five-paragraph item that appeared at the bottom of the feature page one Saturday in the winter of 1898.[24] Although the papers of the day were, as we shall see, full of short city sketches, they were not like this.

> "She was a plain, practical sort of woman, who didn't take the little girl on her lap, but let her sway and stagger against other passengers as the car whizzed around curves. The little girl was rosy-cheeked; a blue woolen hood was drawn down over her ears and little fuzzy yellow ringlets curled around her face. Her coat was obviously an out-grown-elder-sister affair, and her hands were bare. At Fiftieth street the woman spoke:
>
> 'Think it over, Bessie,' she said. 'You know how much you have. Take your choice! But let me know before we get out. I have no time to bother with you in the store. You can do as you like, and have the fur-lined gloves or the doll.'

> Bessie didn't look pleased at the prospect. She was standing near the door, where the wind blew in. At Twenty-seventh street the woman spoke again.
>
> 'Have you decided?'
>
> 'Yes'm. The doll,' faltered Bessie. Silence again until they neared Madison Square. The woman prepared to leave the car and handed several packages to the little girl. Flakes of snow blew in with the wind, and Bessie shivered as she went out on the platform. They alighted and crossed the street. At the corner the little girl stammered: 'I think I want the--the gloves, instead, please.' And two tears for no reason whatever rolled down her cold cheeks."

The unknown reporter of this incident is, to be sure, in close contact with the personnel and machinery of sentimental melodrama--from Bessie's little blue hood to the unloving mother who elicits the two tears that end the story--but he uses these forms to evoke a deeper theme. The mother, for instance, is no fairy-tale force of evil, mobilized simply to stir our emotions. If she presses little Bessie to choose between play and necessity, the portrayal of this "plain, practical woman" yet permits us to imagine that she has suffered something similar herself. As for Bessie, to be sure, her "fuzzy yellow ringlets" and "faltering," "stammering" speech aim straight at our emotions. But she does not weep out of any simple, pathetic deprivation. She confronts the irony that she may "do as she likes and have the fur-lined gloves or the doll." By balancing the ironic observation that Bessie cries for "no reason at all" against her tears, the climax of the story invites us to reflect rather than weep. Why is Bessie crying? Her tears mark the strain of accommodating mature choice in her young heart, the pain of passage from childlike desire to adult resignation. At the end of this Wordsworthian rite of passage, Bessie knows all too well "how much she has."

It is worth emphasizing here that this humane comprehension of the lives of the city was hardly the characteristic appeal of the newspaper writing of the day, even though the press often described random actual incidents and trumpeted its interest in everyday life. Pulitzer's World, for instance, often labeled its feature page, "Short Stories of City Life," but the stories, as noted earlier, turned on oddity, novelty, or sentiment. For instance, one such World item, "Contrasts in a City Block," observes that "a strange human tide ebbs and flows . . . at the foot of East Twenty-sixth street." There, where Bellevue Hospital and the city morgue stood hard by the New York Yacht Club, "weeping women on their way to the Morgue to claim their dead or in search of the missing are passed by charming belles and stately dames bound for a day's outing on the water."[25] Worthwhile as the sketch is as a bit of local color, it nonetheless depends upon a stark, unelaborated contrast between rich and poor, secure and miserable, each stereotypically portrayed. Nor is this selection even typical. Companion stories included "Admiral Dewey's Favorite Flower". Another piece,"Mrs. Frank Leslie's Pet is Dying" reports the moribund state of "the most petted and pampered dog in New York. "A Bulldog his Missle" described a man ascending from a subterranean bar, who, as his arms reached street level, deftly snatched a bulldog that happened to pass by and hurled it back over his head, down upon the companions behind him. The story's last paragraph is noteworthy in light of the limited resonance of the novel event and the contrast with the story of little Bessie: "Why did he seize the dog? He says he doesn't know himself."

Bessie's story shows that there could be significant distinctions of theme and effect among stories of street life. And her tale illustrates how Steffens could, without absurdity, link the idea of tragedy and journalistic writing. Slight as it is, Bessie's story reproduces the tragic pattern as she sparking moves to "an epiphany of law, of that which is and must be."[26] Rather than simple astonishment, her story evokes a reflective empathy.

The Commercial Advertiser's writers often explicitly pointed, not to the novel, but to "interesting," "typical" or "characteristic" features of human behavior and social life. These terms may carry a note of genteel condescension but they also project the reporter as an observer of something more than simple events. The reporter is here not a jaundiced eye but a "student of human nature," a "people-watcher"; not a "roue of literature" but, perhaps, a "boulevardier."

Supporting this stance was the technical practice of basing stories on long passages of quotation from a source. Unlike the typical source of contemporary journalism, from whom reporters "get quotes," these sources might function as narrators of the story and commentators upon it as well. As we see in "Sad Common Sense," stories could be directly observed, but in other cases the journalist "reported" the source's telling of the story. For instance, in "Pleas of an Old Tenant,"[27] an electrotyper (possibly an Advertiser employee) looking for an apartment is the source of a story about an old man who will be evicted if the electrotyper takes the rooms. (The old man was born in the house and occupied it all but has lost ownership and now occupies one top-floor room. Previously, new owners somehow never got around to renting the house but the latest one employs a rental agent who says that as soon as the top floor is rented the man must leave.) The Advertiser story contains long quotations from the old tenant, apparently reconstructed by the writer from the electrotyper's account. The reporter did not of course give up his literary skill to the source. He still selected the story and shaped its pace, structure and emphasis, deciding when to paraphrase, when to set a scene, when to use the source's narrative. But use of this more eloquent, free-speaking source/narrator could reveal depths in the narrative not available to a reporter assembling a story from a mosaic of carefully attributed and confirmed sources. For instance in Abraham Cahan's "Lost in His Own Land,"[28] the source is a friend of the main character, a lone Yankee who moves into a neighborhood of non-English-speaking immigrants because it stands on the land where he, in far more bucolic times, was born. Despite his defiant motives he becomes a revered figure in the neighborhood and develops warm ties to some of the residents, though in himself he still believes he hates all foreigners. Cahan's words set the scene but the friend's narrative occupies the second half of the tale. The friend closes the story with a comment that would not be easily available to the "objective" report but adds a note of indeterminacy that is uncommon in journalistic writing: "'He is a queer old fellow. . . . He is still sure he hates all his neighbors and that he wants all foreigners expelled from the country. . . . And yet watch him going home and returning the salutations of his neighbors. If you think he hates them you are mistaken, or he is.'"[29]

The interested observers who told these stories were often conspicuously portrayed in the story itself. "The Chronic Observer" is the narrator of one tale.[30] "Barker," the source of another, is a kind of humane civic naturalist, who, employing a newspaper for a "blind" and a few good cigars as "bait," "collects" "Odd Park Specimens."[31] One recalls in this connection that Steffens called termed the artistic approach to journalism both "scientifically and artistically the true ideal . . . ."[32] In a similarly scientific spirit, stories were based not on an event, but on a characteristic human emotion. Steffens sent out the staff "to look for one instance of gaiety in New York, with the promise to report it in the paper as conspicuously as a murder"[33] or to examine "How Grief is Expressed" with reporters instructed "to observe directly the actual expression of sorrow" ("the reports," Steffens said, "did not bear out the stage and the novels; there is more blowing of the nose in real life.")[34] In charming testimony to public recognition of the Advertiser's approach, a newsboy wrote, and the paper published, a badly spelled but well-observed study of the stratagems of panhandlers, who were then a new enough social type to require definition as "a kind of vagrant."[35]

On The Commercial Advertiser, a story might be made of "What a Fire Escape is Good For," with observations ranging from the aesthetics of the fire escape's lines and colors against the sky to description of how the Italian residents of a particular tenement use it as balcony, garden, knife sharpener, and summer bedroom--everything but fire escape.[36] Here the journalist still observes noteworthy details of the public scene but the "news" is the human creative faculty finding unpredictable and multiple uses for even utilitarian objects. In this vein, stories might focus on creative activity itself, such as a piece on "Books Sailors Read" (Ben Hur and Pilgrim's Progress were favorites)[37] and stories on "Songs Sold in the Streets"[38] and "Street Song Cynicism"[39], which report on the ephemera of urban life as items of culture.

The Advertiser's imaginative sympathies for the denizens and scenes of the city can also be distinguished from the writing of the more conservative papers, including The Commercial Advertiser itself before Steffens took over. For instance, in writing stories about the new immigrants, other papers took the official perspective. A story about immigrant arrivals in the pre-Steffens Commercial Advertiser, titled "Uncle Sam's Guards," enlivened its account with images of the Commissioner of Immigration and his deputies as "watchdogs," who "seem gifted with second sight" and "keep the unworthy from entering."[40] In the conservative Evening Post, the story, "Held at the Barge-Office/Immigrants Before Boards of Inquiry" also adopted the watchful, suspicious perspective of the hearing officer, called "the Major."[41] This tale paused over the impressive fact that the Major speaks twelve languages and his stenographer six. But Steffens, when he was with the Evening Post,[42] and Abraham Cahan with the The Commercial Advertiser dove into the individual stories of the immigrants: "Amalia Mahr came here from Silesia, Germany, to marry Karl Vogt, her sweetheart. She had never seen him in the old country, and he had been in America before she first heard of him, yet he was her sweetheart."[43] Or Cahan would sketch a group in a way that suggested both the anonymity of the mass and its seething, creative variety:

> A fresh shipload of immigrants had arrived at the Barge Office. There were Italians, Slovaks, Magyars, some Syrians and some Armenians in the consignment. As the detention pen was filling up, green, yellow and black asserted themselves as an extemporaneous tri-color in a mass of fluctuating hues and shapes. There was the usual rush and hubbub in the room. Everybody was on pins and needles to get out 'into America.' Everybody asked questions, pleaded, cried, cursed, or kissed the clerks' hands.[44]

This willingness to treat as fully human (and therefore as fully rounded "characters") people who seemed beneath the notice of news of official procedures, began in Steffens fondness, described by Hutchins Hapgood, for "articles so written that the reader could see, while getting the news, the background of men behind the news." What counts here is that this "soft" approach could yield solid journalism. Hapgood described how he interviewed the new director of the city aquarium, Tammany-appointed and of course totally ignorant of piscine affairs.

> When I asked Colonel Jones how he found out whether the water was right for the fish he said that when the fish died he knew it wasn't good for them.

Steffens put the story on the front page, and he could reasonably do so, Hapgood recalled, because the "colorful" quotation also conveyed "a great political moment."[45]

As this anecdote may suggest, the fineness of The Commercial Advertiser's literary journalism lies also partly in its vitality and exactitude as literary sociology. Many of The Commercial Advertiser's human-interest stories can also be read as parables of urbanization, immigration and commercialization. It is noteworthy, for instance, that Bessie's maturity is to be defined in a choice between commodities on sale in one of the new department stores. And her crisis is defined when her mother makes a remark that springs equally from her character and from her urban situation:

> "Take your choice! But let me know before we get out. I have no time to bother with you in the store."

Similarly, the stories of the old tenant and lone Yankee discussed above are set into motion by the city's sprawling growth. In another story, a little drama of commercialism meeting gentility, a poor but well-bred lady through a display of unremitting, genuine politeness wrests considerate service from a rude department store clerk.[46] Yet another story describes how a sporting mare crossing the Grand Circle was so spooked by motor traffic she just sat down, quivering, in the traces. Reported because it was interesting in itself, the anecdote today tellingly indexes the transition into the motor age. (The motorists and trolleymen, by the way, were reported to stop their vehicles, waiting patiently, without laughter or mockery, until the steed regained her composure and drew the buggy off.)[47]

None of this is to say that Steffens was the originator or sole practitioner of literary journalism. Steffens himself acknowledged that "the star men of the other papers . . . likewise were laboring at the art of telling stories."[48] The intellectual climate of the Progressive Era clearly supported Steffens' journalism. The active debate between realism and romance highlighted the possibility of finding art in the mundane. Moreover, as John Higham has noted, the time provided general precedents for Steffens desire to bridge the gap between fact and art: "Americans resisted sharp segregations between various levels and types of thought: between facts and values, intellect and intuition, the scientific and the supra-scientific." William James, John Dewey and Charles Saunders Peirce, Higham observes, "wanted to do away with walls separating subjective values from objective facts," finding in the external world a promise of "ultimate goodness and harmony."[49]

Steffens drew upon this unitary sensibility to bridge the gap between "hard news" and "soft," between "fact" and "color," between literature and journalism. In the process, he gave a new inflection to the concept of "human interest." Where papers like the Sun and the World treated of sex, scandal, conflict and oddity--subjects in which, we might say, "it is only human" to be interested--Steffens pursued what we might call, "humane interest"--portraying the creative struggle of persons and groups to adapt to a dynamic and difficult social environment. He reversed the fundamental world-view of journalism--that, as Hapgood put it, "the interesting exists only in the unusual"--to center journalistic writing in "the inexpressible significance of the usual." [50]

In the end the importance of these stories may rest more in the fact that they are journalism than that they are literature. They are readable and significant today but the claim for them cannot be that they are enduring literary texts. Rather their value lies in the way they credibly posit and report in the passing scene the complexity and richness of literature. Steffens' writers insisted that the world of the city possessed, even in the lowest circumstances, depths of beauty, complexity, creativity and significance. In this fashion, he used literary journalism less to seek a place on Parnassus than to contribute to public consciousness a richer, more complex sense of experience.[51]

Notes

[1] The sources and history of this ideal lie well beyond the scope of this essay. To suggest the complexity of the question, however, we might note that the journalistic interest in the inherent significance of everyday life might be traced equally to commercial and religious motives. The Penny Press had good business reasons to offer a mass audience readable, gossipy copy. At the same time, David Paul Nord shows that the definition of news as the interesting private occurrence as well as the important official action grows from the sense that "all occurrences--perhaps especially 'strange and wondrous' ones--were clothed in religious, and therefore public, meaning." (See "Teleology and News: The Religious Roots of American Journalism, 1630-1730," paper presented to the History Divison, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Portland, Ore., July, 1988, p. 2 [forthcoming in the the Journal of American History, June 1990].) Charles A. Dana who perfected the style in commercial journalism that recounts random occurrences in "sparkling" prose, linked the two ideas in a famous quip: "I have always felt that whatever the Divine Providence permitted to occur I was not too proud to report." See "The Art of Newspaper Making" in Interpretations of Journalism, ed. Frank Luther Mott & Ralph D. Casey, (NY: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1937), p. 159.

[2] Edward P. Mitchell, Memoirs of an Editor (New York: Scribner's, 1924), pp. 416-17. Cited in Thomas B. Connery, Fusing Fictional Technique and Journalistic Fact: Literary Journalism in the 1890s Newspaper (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Brown Univ., 1984), p. 26.

[3] See Michael Schudson, "Why News is the Way it Is," Raritan (Winter 1983), p. 119 & 122-23.

[4] The famous maxim is John Bogart's, city editor of the New York Sun under Charles A. Dana. Bogart was replying to a cub reporter who had demanded

a definition of news. "Son," he said, "when a dog bites a man that is not news, because it happens so often. But if a man bites a dog, that's news." See Allen Churchill, Park Row (New York: Rinehart & Co., 1958), p. 15.

[5] Types from City Streets (New York: Garrett Press, 1970), p. 97.

[6] See "The Dark Continent of American Journalism," in Reading the News, ed. Robert Karl Manoff and Michael Schudson, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1987), p. 168.

[7] See Mitchell Stephens, A History of the News: From the Drum to the Satellite (N.Y.: Viking, 1988), p. 141.

[8] See "Journalism and the Larger Truth" in Believing the News (St. Petersburg, Fla.: The Poynter Institute, n.d., p. 235). Joseph Pulitzer expressed this ideal in placards he placed about the World newsroom reading, "Accuracy, Accuracy, Accuracy."

[9] On a paper I worked for, one editor called for a type of story he called the "Monday-morning astonisher," designed to restore reader's to the news habit after Sunday's contemplations. Edna Buchanan, noted police reporter of the Miami Herald, told Calvin Trillin that her ideal news lead would "cause a reader who is having breakfast with his wife to 'spit out his coffee, clutch his chest and say, "My God, Martha! Did you read this?"'". See "Profiles: Edna Buchanan," The New Yorker, 61 (17 Feb. 1986), pp. 39-42 etc.

[10] See Jacques Barzun, "Preface" to Theodore M. Bernstein, Watch Your Language (New York: Atheneum, 1983), p. xi. Barzun deplores Bernstein's "concessions to prevailing ideas of color and liveliness in news stories and headlines," but adds, "I recognize he is talking primarily to writers whose professional neurosis is to despair of being attended to and in whom, therefore, a kind of solemn ritual clowning is inevitable."

[11] Steffens in a 23 March 1898 letter to Joseph Steffens, his father. See The Letters of Lincoln Steffens, edited with introductory notes by Ella

Winter and Granville Hicks (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., [c. 1938]), I, p. 123.

[12] Joseph Lincoln Steffens, The Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1931), p. 316.

[13] Norman Hapgood, The Changing Years (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1930), p. 127.

[14] Autobiography, pp. 311-312.

[15] For a thorough discussion of the literary qualities of 1890s journalism see Thomas B. Connery, Fusing Fictional Technique and Journalistic Fact: Literary Journalism in the 1890s Newspaper (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Brown Univ., 1984).

[16] Autobiography, p. 312.

[17] Autobiography, pp. 314-5.

[18] Autobiography, p. 314.

Michael D. Marcaccio (The Hapgoods: Three Earnest Brothers [Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977], p. 51) says that the staff achieved neither great fame in belles lettres nor influence upon the practice of journalism. The point of the present assessment is precisely that Steffens' successful literary journalism is the more interesting for being carried out by writers of high general ability though not true genius. (On the matter of the paper's influence, however, we might observe that the style of The Commercial Advertiser's city stories lives today in the "Talk of the Town" section of The New Yorker).

Chief among The Commercial Advertiser writers was Abraham Cahan, whose advocacy of socialism and Russian realism inspired Steffens' journalistic ideas. Cahan specialized in coverage of the Jewish ghetto for The Commercial Advertiser; produced the ghetto novel Yekl before joining the paper, and later became editor of the Jewish Daily Forward. Cahan's writing for the Advertiser is collected in Grandma Never Lived in America, ed. Moses Rischin (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1985). See also Rischin's "Abraham Cahan and the New York Commercial Advertiser," Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society 43 (September 1953), p. 10-36.

Other writers included:

Hutchins Hapgood, who at The Commercial Advertiser specialized in of Bowery and ghetto characters, and later wrote Types from City Streets, which reflects upon the journalism of the 1890s and The Commercial Advertiser under Steffens. The Spirit of the Ghetto: Studies of the Jewish Quarter in New York (1902; reprint Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967), includes some of his writing for The Commercial Advertiser.

Carl Hovey, whose Commercial Advertiser stories Steffens commended for revealing political realities through effective human-interest description, became editor of Metropolitan magazine.

Norman Hapgood, the paper's drama critic and Hutchins' brother, who carried on a democratic theory of journalism at Collier's Weekly [see Michael D. Marcaccio, The Hapgoods: Three Earnest Brothers (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977), p. 51 and passim on both brothers.]

See also Steffens description of the paper's writers, Autobiography, pp. 315-316.

The literary journalism of The Commercial Advertiser is the more interesting for being executed by writers of general talent but not rare personal genius.

[19] Autobiograpy, p. 317.

[20] Autobiography, p. 243.

[21] Autobiography, p. 317.

[22] The Commercial Advertiser did not publish on Sunday. Thomas Connery offers a somewhat higher estimate of the literary quality of The Commercial

Advertiser's breaking news coverage (pp. 79-82), discussing a crime story, "A Little Sicily Murder," in which, "the facts of the case . . are woven into a story and consequently become secondary to the tale of the people involved." However, in hard news coverage like this The Commercial Advertiser only shared the general merit of papers of the day. In the 1890s, the news was often still told in genuine narratives with character and beginning, middle and end. Only later, about a decade into the twentieth century, did the inverted-pyramid style triumph and the term "story" applied to news accounts become a metaphor. In the inverted pyramid "story" is a hierarchy of facts with the narrative often sketched briefly as a species of information.

[23] "Introduction," to Hutchins Hapgood's The Spirit of the Ghetto (Cambridge, Mass.:, 1967), p. xxi.

[24] The Commercial Advertiser, 12 February 1898, p. 9.

[25] The New York World, 15 Oct. 1899, p. 5. Meanwhile, longer World features depended heavily on the allure of sex and sentiment, e.g. "Lured Her Lover to Die with Her"; "Murder of a Farmer and His Adopted Son"; "How Police Cared for the Multitude"; "Ends Her Life for Lack of Love" (1 Oct. 1899, p. 3).

[26] Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1957), p. 208. (Ironically, journalism's notorious readiness to call a "tragedy" what is more properly termed a "disaster", e.g. airplane and automobile crashes, is precisely a function of its melodramatic impulse.)

[27] The Commercial Advertiser, 23 Sept. 1899, p. 9.

[28] The Commercial Advertiser, 14 Feb. 1899 and reprinted in Grandma Never Lived in America, ed. Moses Rischin, pp. 422-4 as "The Last American."

[29] Interestingly for the possibilities of repeating these techniques in daily newspapers today, it seems likely that a tighter emphasis on "sourcing" and attribution would cause many editors to spike such stories as "hearsay."

Moreover, *The Advertiser*'s sources were not usually fully identified, nor do the stories show modern care for confirmation of assertions.

[30] *The Commercial Advertiser*, 20 Jan. 1900, p. 9.

[31] *The Commercial Advertiser*, 6 Sept. 1899, p. 9.

[32] Irving Cheslaw speculates that Steffens scientific stance may have been cultivated in his studies in Germany under Wilhelm Wundt. In any case, Cheslaw perceptively notes that Steffens love of observation links his literary journalism to his muckraking through his "ability to describe accurately aspects of social behavior with a stong sense of their interrelationships." See *An Intellectual Biography of Lincoln Steffens* (unpub. Ph.D. diss., Faculty of Political Science, Columbia Univ., 1952), p. 37.

[33] *Autobiography*, p. 321. The story, "New York Gayety--A Quest" appeared in *The Commercial Advertiser* on 22 Jan. 1898.

[34] Autobiography, *ibid.* "The Expression of Grief" appeared in *The Commercial Advertiser* on 29 Jan. 1898, p. 9, with a story of similar premise, "Love-Making in New York."

[35] *The Commercial Advertiser*, 31 Dec. 1898, p. 10.

[36] *The Commercial Advertiser*, 9 July 1898, p. 9.

[37] *The Commercial Advertiser*, 27 Nov. 1897, p. 4.

[38] *The Commercial Advertiser*, 5 Feb. 1898, p. 9.

[39] *The Commercial Advertiser*, 7 Jan. 1899, p. 9.

[40] *The Commercial Advertiser*, 20 June 1896, p. 18.

[41] *The Commercial Advertiser*, 14 Oct. 1899, p. 21.

[42] See "Excise Candidate No. 15./A Man Who Does Not Think Much of His Examiners", *Evening Post*, Apr. 6, 1895 and with Steffens papers at Columbia University.

[43] Reprinted from *The Commercial Advertiser*, 9 July 1898 in *Grandma Never Lived in America: The New Journalism of Abraham Cahan* (Bloomington:

Indiana Univ. Press), p. 111.

[44] Reprinted from The Commercial Advertiser 6 Sept. 1899 in Grandma Never Lived in America: The New Journalism of Abraham Cahan, p. 123.

[45] Hutchins Hapgood, A Victorian in the Modern World (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939), pp. 138-39. For another anecdote of "feature" coverage effectively conveying the "news," Autobiography, p. 322.

[46] The Commercial Advertiser, 11 Feb. 1899, p. 9.

[47] The Commercial Advertiser, 31 Dec. 1989, p. 9.

[48] Autobiography, p. 317.

[49] John Higham, "The Reorientation of American Culture in the 1890's" in The Origins of Modern Consciousness (Detroit: Wayne St. Univ. Press, 1965), p. 47.

[50] Types from City Streets (New York: Garrett Press, 1970), p. 97.

[51] This assessment of Steffens work at The Commercial Advertiser deliberately focuses on its success in adopting literary journalism as an effective, general journalistic method. Others have dwelt on the paper's limitations: Hapgood called the paper, "An Interesting Failure," accusing Steffens of simply tiring of his literary experiment. (See Types from City Streets [New York: Garrett Press, 1970], pp. 107-112.) Cahan (cited by Cheslaw, p. 43.) noted that "the paper was read by the wealthy, . . .it was never seen on the East Side, . . . it was only found 'in real American neighborhoods'." For all its relative depth, a genteel propriety (unsurprising given the paper's wealthy, conservative readership) generally moderated the subjects of its literary journalism. It is hard, for instance, to imagine Stephen Crane's darker, naturalistic sketches, such as "When a Man Falls in the Street, A Crowd Gathers," appearing in its pages. (See also note 19 above.) Hutchins Hapgood's passion for portraying bums and sharpsters as artists may have blunted his awareness of the brutality of their existence, or of fric-

tions between the groups that fascinated him (see The Hapgoods, p. 72.) And the panoptic interest in the downtrodden, lavished on European immigrants did not extend to African-Americans.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

(wholly or partly reprinted from The Commercial Advertiser)

Cahan, Abraham. Grandma Never Lived in America. Ed. Moses Rischin. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Hapgood, Hutchins. Types from City Streets. New York: Garrett Press, 1970.

______. The Spirit of the Ghetto: Studies of the Jewish Quarter in New York. 1902; reprint Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967.

Secondary Sources

Cheslaw, Irving G. An Intellectual Biography of Lincoln Steffens. Unpub. Ph.D. diss., Faculty of Political Science, Columbia Univ. 1952

Thomas B. Connery. Fusing Fictional Technique and Journalistic Fact: Literary Journalism in the 1890s Newspaper. Unpub. Ph.D. diss., Brown Univ., 1984.

Thomas B. Connery. "Hutchins Hapgood and the Search for a 'New Form of Literature'," Journalism History, 13:1 (Spring 1986), p. 2-9.

Dunn, Robert. World Alive: A Personal Story. New York: Crown Publishers, 1956.

Fine, David M. "Abraham Cahan, Stephen Crane, and the Romantic Tenement Tale of the Nineties," American Studies 14 (1973), pp. 95-107.

Hapgood, Hutchins. *A Victorian in the Modern World.* New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1939. p. 137-147, 172-3.

______. "An Interesting Failure," [an assessment of Steffens work at *The Commercial Advertiser*] in *Types from City Streets.* New York: Garrett Press, 1970, pp. 107-112.

Hapgood, Norman. *The Changing Years: Reminiscences of Norman Hapgood.* NY: Farrar & Rinehart, 1930. p. 102-132.

Horton, Russell M. *Lincoln Steffens.* New York: Twayne, 1974.

Kaplan, Justin. *Lincoln Steffens: A Biography.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974.

Marcaccio, Michael D. *The Hapgoods: Three Earnest Brothers.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977.

Palermo, Parick F. *Lincoln Steffens.* Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1978.

Rischin, Moses. "Introduction," *Grandma Never Lived in America.* Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1985.

______. "Abraham Cahan and the New York *Commercial Advertiser,*" *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* 43 (September 1953), p. 10-36.

Steffens, Joseph Lincoln. *The Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens.* New York:Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1931.

Steffens, Joseph Lincoln. The Letters of Lincoln Steffens, edited with introductory notes by Ella Winter and Granville Hicks. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. [c. 1938].

The World of Lincoln Steffens. Edited by Ella Winter and Herbert Shapiro. New York: Hill and Wang. 1962.

Stinson, Robert. *Lincoln Steffens.* New York: F. Ungar Pub. Co., c. 1979.

THE PRESS-RADIO WAR, 1925-1937:
A FIGHT TO PROTECT THE PROFESSIONAL BOUNDARIES OF JOURNALISM

GWENYTH JACKAWAY

mailing address

INSTRUCTOR,
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
DEPT OF COMMUNICATION
BRONX, NY 10458

DOCTORAL CANDIDATE,
ANNENBERG SCHOOL OF COMM.
UNIV. OF PENNSYLVANIA
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104

SUBMITTED TO THE AEJMC:
25 MARCH 1990

THE PRESS RADIO WAR, 1925-1937:
A FIGHT TO PROTECT THE PROFESSIONAL BOUNDARIES OF JOURNALISM

The Press-Radio War was a conflict which took place between the industries of print journalism and broadcasting in the 1930's, when radio first began covering the news. Essentially what happened was that the print journalists tried to prevent radio from entering the news business. This attempt was made using tactics that included orchestrating sponsor boycotts of radio news, and pressuring the government to tighten regulation on radio advertising. These efforts proved effective, and for several years (1933-1937) the networks actually agreed to dismantle their own news gathering operations, and to obtain their news instead from The Press-Radio Bureau, an organization which was established to provide the broadcasters with summaries of wire service copy. According to the agreement, these news bulletins could only be aired without commercials. In other words, the networks could not profit from broadcasting news. While this arrangement was designed to protect the publishers from losing advertising dollars to radio news, it was doomed from the start. Only the networks had agreeed to participate in the Press-Radio Bureau, and there were 500 independent stations in the nation -- all of whom needed news. It was only a matter of time before news services were established to provide news to those broadcasters, with no restrictions on sponsorship. Faced with this kind of competition, the Press-Radio Bureau could not last, and by 1938, the publishers conceeded that they had lost the war to keep radio out of the news business.

Why did the newspaper industry fight so hard to prevent broadasters from entering journalism? Conventional accounts of the Press-Radio War offer a primarily economic interpretation: namely, that the print journalists were afraid of losing both readers and advertisers to the new medium (1). It is the argument of this paper that while financial concerns were undoutedly involved in this struggle, there were other issues at stake as well. This study explores the sentiments of print journalists during the 1930's towards radio news, as expressed in their industry trade publications. Listening to what journalists of the period had to say about the new competition, one thing becomes clear: in addition to an attempt to protect the economic stability of journalism, the Press-Radio War was also a fight to defend the boundaries of the professional domain of journalism. At issue were questions of who is journalist, what the news message should sound like and which medium is the best for the transmission of information to the public. Throughout their discussions of radio newscasting, the print journalists continually argued, in various ways, that the standards of journalism could only be maintained if newspapers, and not radio, were the source of the nation's news.

RADIO'S THREAT TO THE PROFESSIONAL DOMAIN OF JOURNALISM

The commencement of radio newscasting meant that print journalists were no longer the primary group of media professionals providing the public with news on a daily basis. Competition had arrived, and many print journalists were not happy about it. In their discussions of the 'problems' with radio news, they attacked broadcast journalism on three levels: the messengers, the message and the mode.

The newscasters were accused of lacking the training and experience necessary to cover the news objectively, the newscasts themselves were dismissed as being sensational and inaccurate, and the oral mode of communication was deemed inappropriate for news dissemination. In short, print journalists who were opposed to broadcast news argued that radio could not live up to professional journalism's standards of objectivity and therefore could not do an adequate job of providing the nation with news. The 'solution' they offered was the Press Radio Bureau, an arrangement wherein radio would be supplied with news by the wire services, thereby insuring that the institution of print journalism would retain control over the process of news dissemination.

Critique of the Messengers:

When the new medium of radio began covering news, the 'messengers' were closely scrutinized by print journalists and found lacking. The broadcasters were accused of being inexperienced and untrained, and therefore unqualified to be considered as journalists. Indeed, there is a marked elitism in the attitude of print journalists towards the radio announcers of the day. For instance, in an article in The American Press in 1934, Roy Howard, president of Scripps-Howard Enterprises was quoted as saying that the whole conflict between the press and radio could be boiled down to the following question:

> Is news a commodity which grocery clerks and filling station attendents are competent to gather and disseminate, or is there something to the idea that it takes alert, trained journalists to gather, transmit, edit and publish news? (2)

To perform the job of a grocery clerk or a gas station attendent requires neither great intellect nor extensive schooling. These are positions which are held by persons occupying the lower end of the socioeconomic scale. In comparing the radio news announcers to grocery clerks and filling station attendents, Howard was suggesting that the differences between the print journalists and broadcasters go beyond levels of training to differences in class status. The implication here, as in other comments we will explore, is that 'trained' print journalists were considered superior to 'untrained' newscasters.

In the same article, Frank Stockbridge, the editor of *The American Press*, expressed the opinion that the "penetrating question" posed by Howard is "the one that goes to the root of the conflict between the newspaper and broadcasting industries" (3) In other words, what Stockbridge was saying is that one of the key issues at stake in the struggle between radio and the press was the question of who is a journalist, or, who should occupy the role of the nation's news gatherers. In considering these questions, Stockbridge went on to pose another one, asking his readers: "Did you ever know a comic strip artist", he asked, "who was also a good reporter?". Comic strip artists are associated with entertainment and amusement. Their work is frequently created for an audience of children, and they communicate primarily with visual images. Journalists on the other hand are associated with information and educating the public, their work is predominantly consumed by adults, and their messages are mainly composed of the written word. The image of the comic strip artist, in other words, is in many ways the polar opposite of that of the journalist. In comparing the radio announcers to cartoonists therefore, Stockbridge, like Howard, implied that the radio newscasters were not, and were inacable of being, good journalists.

This charge is repeated in a number of articles in Editor and Publisher, all of which attempt to show the ways in which the radio newscasters were lacking in the skills necessary to do a good job at reporting the news. One editorial from June of 1929, for instance, criticised NBC for sending "men untrained in newsgathering" to cover a live boat race. According to the writer, "at no stage of the race were the radio reporters certain of the information they broadcast", while, in contrast, the newspaper reporters who were on the scene reportedly "knew what they were seeing and how to describe it" (4). Mr. E.H. Wilder, manager of the California Newspaper Publishers' Association, told Editor and Publisher in July of 1931 that the CNPA believed that the print journalist could do a much better job broadcasting spot news than the radio men employed at the time. "Many of the details unnoticed" by them, he explained, "would be noted almost unconsciously by the trained reporter" (5). Another article expressed the view quite bluntly, stating that "the plain truth is that the radio newsmen are poor reporters" (6).

Similar kinds of criticism were offered of the broadcasters' handling of the Lindbergh baby kidnapping in March of 1932. Several articles contained charges that the radio news men lacked the reportorial skills necessary to cover the kidnapping. One editorial accused radio stations of having sent men who had been "selected for voice quality and program skill", but lacked "trained news judgement" to handle the flood of information that confronted them at the height of the crisis (7). James Hasenack, circulation manager of the New York Sun told Editor and Publisher that he did not feel radio had hampered newspaper sales, because "people are beginning to doubt the veracity of news bulletins on the air". "So many inaccurate and fake announcements concerning developments in the Lindbergh story have been put out by radio," he said, "that people buy newspapers to find out the truth" (8).

This accusation of inaccurate reporting came also from Marlen Pew, editor of Editor and Publisher, who expressed the opinion that "during the Lindbergh case, the radio established its novice rating in the dissemination of news", charging that "on three distinct occasions it flashed false reports that the child had been found". Extending his criticism to a more general commentary on radio news technique, Pew observed that "far too often the radio has shown its lack of knowledge both of news editing and the ethics of journalism". As a solution, he advised that the broadcasters would benefit from a careful study of "the practices of the Associated Press and of the reputable newspapers served by that great news-gathering organization" (9). Here the standards and practices of the wire services, from which most newspapers obtained their news reports, are held up as the ideal to which the broadcasters should aspire. Clearly, the editorial perspective of Editor and Publisher was that the newscasters were often in violation of these canons.

In addition to claiming that radio announcers broadcast false stories, journalists also charged the newscasters with being sensational in their style of delivery. On the occasion of the Chicago Fire in May of 1934, for example, the newscasters were accused of delivering "hysterical reports" which exagerated the extent of the danger and led the public to believe that the peril was greater than it actually was. Quoting an article in the Chicago Daily News, Editor and Publisher reported that:

> Inexperienced radio news broadcasters became hysterical with excitement and recited many wild tales from their point of view on tops of buildings close to the fire...The radio boys, untrained in news gathering, undisciplined in the value of accuracy...hysterically broadcast every alarming rumor that reached their ears.

Meanwhile, the account continues, "the real facts were being gathered by trained newspaper men, whose technique it is to sift grain from chaff (emph mine, g.j.) (10). Here the broadcasters are portrayed as 'boys', whose lack of training and discipline render their news reports untrustworthy. The print journalists on the other hand are described as "men" with the professional skills required to deliver the 'true' story to the public.

The word "hysterical" appears three times in the text of this article as well as in the headline ("Radio Reporting of Chicago Fire Called "Hysterical" by Press"). To become hysterical is to lose control over one's emotions, to enter into a state where one's reactions and behavior is often irrational, controlled by the emotions rather than the intellect. Clearly, such a condition is far removed from the calm, detached state required for making 'objective' observations. Thus, an accusation of hysteria is a grave one indeed, from print journalists whose professional ideals are based upon the code of objectivity. For someone to become hysterical meant, essentially, becoming unable to carry out the job of the journalist: namely, to report, in a dispassionate, objective manner, the facts, uncolored by one's own emotions.

Similar criticism was offered of the way radio announcers handled the story of an earthquake in southern California in March of 1933.

"Quake Coverage Hampered by Radio", announced the headline of an Editor and Publisher article that told of "ugly, unfounded rumors spread by quavering radio announcers", who reportedly broadcast "terrorizing messages of tidal waves, vast death lists, famine, pestilence and horrors that could be conjured only in a terror-stricken and uninformed mind" (emph mine, g.j.). The article goes on to report that newspapers and press associations were "deluged" with calls from citizens who had been frightened by the radio broadcasts, and that "much valuable time was wasted tracking down phantom disaster rumors". In order to prevent panic, newspapers issued extras to clarify the actual extent of the danger (11). Once again, radio newscasters are depicted as prone to extreme emotional states in which they are unable to distinguish fact from rumor, and therefore as dangerous to the public. In contrast, the 'objective' facts about the earthquake are said to have come from the print journalists, who are portrayed as stepping in to calm a public panicked by the radio newscasters' inaccuracy.

Critique of the Message:

The faults that journalists found with the radio news message were a direct extension of the complaints they had about the broadcast messengers. Just as the broadcasters were dismissed as lacking the training and experience necessary to report the news objectively, so were the newscasts themselves denounced as being inaccurate and sensational or over dramatized. In addition, print journalists pointed out, radio news gave only headline coverage, providing insufficient detail in its treatment of a story, thereby failing to adhere to the conventions of the print news story, and falling outside the newspaper model of the proper news message. Thus the newscasts, like the newscasters, were measured against the ideal standards of journalism, and found lacking.

Numerous articles in Editor and Publisher reflect the harsh criticism being leveled against radio news by the anti-radio journalists. As radio commentator and former newspaper reporter Elmer Davis put it, "(d)ay by day newspapers insisted, directly or by innuendo, that...you can't believe the news you get on the radio..." (12) Davis' claim is confirmed by Journalism Quarterly, which reported, in an article entitled "The History of Press-Radio Relationships", that during the early 30's, "many publishers of the non-radio group took every opportunity to rap false, inaccurate or poorly presented newscasts" (13). And indeed they did.

An editorial in Editor and Publisher, for instance, observed in March of 1932 that as far as covering news is concerned, "the radio spirit is willing but the techniques are extremely weak", lacking the "hair-trigger speed and accuracy" that newspapers must posess "in superlative degree" (14). One of the 'weak' techniques being used by the radio newscasters, according to some print journalists, was the failure to obtain credible sources for their news bulletins. As the ANPA Radio Committee claimed in their report of 1934, "in an effort to outdo the newspapers and other competing radio stations, many broadcasters were resorting to a promiscuous broadcast of news from unreliable sources" (15). In addition to accusing radio news of lacking credibility, this statement once again suggests that newscasters were lacking in proper restraint over their behavior, as is implied by the use of the word "promiscuous". The publishers also indicate their belief that the violations of journalistic standards of objectivity and accuracy on radio news were taking place because stations were trying to 'beat the competition'. If this were in fact the case, it would indicate that the broadcasters were more interested in making a profit through attracting the public with dramatic stories, than reporting the news accurately. A 'crime' of which the tabloids were also frequently accused.

Another occasion on which the degree of accuracy in radio news was questioned was in the fall of 1933, when CBS news applied for admission to the press galleries of the United States Congress. A number of prominent publishers expressed their opposition to the idea. One of them, James Stahlman, chairman of the Southern Newspaper Publishers' Association argued that allowing radio newsmen into the galleries would be "inimical to the interests of accurate presentation of the news of Congress, as evidenced by numerous distorted and inaccurate news broadcasts". Stahlman explained that radio's record on spot news broadcasting was "wholly contrary to the public interest because of inaccurate reporting and willful misrepresentation of facts" (16).

The issue of inaccuracy in newscasting was of concern to enough print journalists that it was addressed at several of their professional gatherings. At the annual convention of the ANPA in 1933, for example, the radio committee asserted that

> Many false statements and exaggerated reports, which have been broadcast recently *by stations that do not have newspaper sources for news*, had demonstrated to the public that the unrestricted and unregulated broadcasting of news has resulted in the spreading of false rumors. (emph mine, gj)

The committee's report went on to say that the "false statements and exaggerated reports" that were being broadcast had placed an added burden on newspapers to "reconstruct the true facts in the minds of the people" (17). Implicit in this statement is the belief that unless the radio news message is supplied by newspapers, it cannot be relied upon for accuracy. Also suggested here is that despite the presence of the new radio competition, there would still be a need for newspapers -- namely, the provision of the 'true' story. At another professional gathering of journalists, this one the Minnesota Editorial Association, a resolution was adopted, calling on radio to "cease the circulation of loose statements and rumors in news broadcasts" (18). The association further resolved to pursue the initiation of legislative action on a local or national level to prevent the "circulation of loose rumors over the air". No such legislation was ever enacted.

Like the tabloid newspapers of the time, radio newscasts were accused not only of lacking accuracy, but also of being sensational and exaggerated in nature. Indeed, the direct comparison was made in

March of 1932, in an editorial in Editor and Publisher, in which it was remarked that "(a)s a news and advertising medium", radio "appears to be developing along purely emotional lines, following lines that the 'tabs' have profitably exploited" (19). A number of articles in the early to mid 'thirties emphasized this issue of appeal to the emotions, arguing that radio news was designed more to entertain than to inform the public. For example, Karl Bikel, president of the United Press, told the American Press in 1936 that he felt the technique of radio news broadcasting is quite different from that of newspaper production. "It is far more closely allied to the theatre and the movies than it is to journalism", he explained, adding that "successful broadcasting requires showmanship of a high order" (20). A similar image was offered in 1931, also in the American Press, this time by George Cecil Cowing, a reporter for the Pasadena Star-News. In his observations on the differences between print and broadcast news, he took the position that while "the newspaper business is journalism", "radio is a species of show business, with overtones of peddling and soap-boxing" (21).

The business of show business is the creation of drama and excitement, and on several occasions Editor and Publisher expressed the viewpoint that the radio news stories were exagerated in order to make them more engaging. "The techninique of radio announcing," an editorial argued in 1934, "is designed to get the listeners excited" (22). Another article, this one in 1936, voiced concern that news flashes were "polished" to "catch and hold attention" (23). And as early as 1928, Marlen Pew, the editor of Editor and Publisher, wrote that for the radio broadcaster covering a political convention, the events at hand are simply "high tension interest for the passing moment, a colorful picture to be described in hot-fire talk" (24).

The issue here is the conflict between entertainment and information -- between intellect and emotion. Blurring the boundaries between fact and fiction poses serious challenges to the credibility of journalists, and emotionally enhanced delivery, to some, implies subjectivity. The journalistic code of objectivity based its claim to authority, in part, on presenting information in a detached manner, without apparent bias. This non-emotional stance was, and still is, considered a key component of the plausibility of news reports. Contemporary critics of television 'tabloid journalism' frequently appeal to this argument in their claims that these talk shows -- such as Donahue, Oprah, or Geraldo -- are not really journalism. For example, in a debate over this issue on the Larry King Live show, which is itself a form of 'talk show journalism, Jack Nelson, the Washington Bureau Chief of the L.A. Times argued that such shows as Donahue are not journalism. "Journalism", he said, "is providing information, educational information to the public, and I think that talk show hosts indulge in entertainment gimmicks, acting, titilation, not really trying to provide information to the people". Nelson went on to acknowledge that while reporters do write leads to attract readers, they "also try to write a relatively objective story that would impart information and would not just be for entertainment or titilation" (25) (emph mine, gj). Here again we are told that those whose primary aim is to appeal to the emotions of an audience are not journalists, and that in order to educate the public and disseminate objective information the delivery must not be designed primarily to entertain. Nelson also echoes, over fifty years after the Press-Radio

War, the same argument that print and not broadcast journalism is the most reliable and objective source of the news.

Thus journalists who were critical of radio news during the 'thirties felt that the emotionally enhanced delivery of the newscasts interfered with the accuracy and objectivity of the reports. For example, on the occasion of the Chicago fire in May of 1934, Editor and Publisher described the radio announcers as having focused mainly on giving their listeners "a thrilling word picture", noting that this emphasis on "excitement and wild tales" leads to "highly colored reports" (26). Over ten years later the way radio men handled the Chicago fire was cited in a handbook on writing radio news as an example of irresponsible radio news coverage. In his News By Radio, Mitchell Charnley, professor of journalism at the University of Minnesota compared the way in which the Press-Radio Bureau and Transradio Press handled the story. The Press-Radio Bureau report, which was supplied by the newspaper wire services, read as follows:

> A disastrous fire was raging in Chicago's stockyards tonight. All available apparatus was summoned by a general alarm. Three firemen are killed. Two bank buildings, The Drovers National Bank and the Live Stock National, with large funds in their vaults, are destroyed. (27)

Note that the Press Radio accout consists of short sentences, which are limited for the most part to an account of the events, with little description and few adjectives.

The Transradio account on the other hand, began by describing the "lurid tongues of flame visible for hundreds of miles" which "stabbed the night" as a "raging inferno" swept through the Chicago stockyards. The bulletin continued, reporting that

> Thousands of persons are streaming from the old tenement houses of Chicago's South Side carrying their belongings with them in a frantic exodus from the fire area as a southwest wind sweeps the flames on through miles of stockyards towards the center of Chicago

and concluded with a grim observation that "the odor of burning meat permeates the atmosphere" and that "smoke hangs like a black fog over the city" (28). In contrast with the Press-Radio bulletin, the Transradio report is far more descriptive, using dramatic adjectives to provide the reader with a sense of the panic and destruction that accompanied the fire.

In his discussion of the relative merits of these two styles of reporting, Charnley leaves little doubt as to which approach he favors. He praises the Press-Radio story as being "brief, factual and colorless", and dismisses the Transradio report as "striving for color, and overwritten", describing it as an example of an attempt to "compensate with verbiage for lack of specific facts" (29). Once again, the dry, unemtional nature of the news message written by print journalists is held up as an example of factual news reporting while the emotional coverage of the same subject matter by newscasters is criticised for being excessively 'colorful', and lacking in factuality.

In addition to violating journalistic standards by commiting the 'crimes' of inaccuracy and sensationalism, radio news was judged harshly for giving only surface coverage of news stories. Print journalists commented frequently that radio could never do an adequate job of handling the nation's news because it failed to present the kind of detailed portrait of events that newspapers provide. For example, a 1928 editorial in Editor and Publisher stated emphatically that "by no stretch of the imagination can we see radio doing a thorough job", and spoke of the disservice that would be done to the public "if radio pretends to cover the news field" (30). Another, several years later, asserted that "radio cannot do the newspaper job", adding that if it were to try and do so there "could be no adequate or proper coverage of the news" (31). And in January of 1933 the ANPA Bulletin observed that because of the brevity of radio news bulletins, a man whose only source of information was "the smallest and poorest of our daily newspapers" would, by the end of the year be better informed than someone who "had spent his entire time trying to get the daily news of the world through a radio set" (32).

In discussing the 'insufficient' nature of radio news coverage, some articles argued that this limitation of the broadcast news message -- its brevity -- would insure that Americans would never give up newspapers in favor of radio. Radio listeners, the print journalists explained, would be compelled to buy a paper "to read the complete story" (33), since the newscasts were not providing it for them. As Frank Stockbridge, put it in 1934, the news bulletins "whet the appetite for the paper itself, with its fuller and more detailed account" (34). Frank Arnold, a journalist writing for Editor and Publisher, observed that while the radio account merely calls attention to events of the day, the public can find a story's "full expression in a fully illustrated, carefully-worded article appearing in the newspaper" (35).

Similarly, at a conference in 1931 on the role of radio and the press in international relations, Victor Rosewater, editor of the Omaha Bee (and later, author of a history of the wire services in

America), likened radio to "a glorified megaphone", which merely "whets the appetite, and spurs the buying of the next edition of the paper carrying fuller details" (36). The general attitude here is clear: radio news is the appetizer, newspapers provide the main course. The 'insuffficient' depth of coverage provided by the newscasts was offered by print journalists as further evidence that only newspapers, and not radio, could effectively fill the role of providing the public with news. In other words, the journalists who criticised broadcast news implied that even if radio tried to enter the domain of journalism, they could never do the job as well as the newspapers.

Throughout these comments there is the implicit assumption that the succinct nature of radio news is an inherent feature of the medium and its message. Karl Bikel, president of the United Press told Editor and Publisher in 1928 that "as far as news is concerned, the radio is a great bulletin board. And by its limitations it can never be more than a bulletin board" (37). This theme of the inherent 'limitations' of the radio news message appeared again in an editorial in 1933, which states flatly that "radio cannot do the news job because of physical limitations that are obvious" (38). In a similar manner, writing for Editor and Publisher that same year, Frank Miller, editor of the South Bend Tribune declared that "news presented by radio is and always will be necessarily brief" (39).

There are several ways in which to interpret these comments. It is possible, for example, that in assuming that the cursory treatment of news on radio is inherent to the medium, the print journalists made an error common to many critics of broadcasting: they confused a socially constructed feature of the broadcast format with 'natural' limitations of the technology. News by radio is not necessarily brief -- it can be long-winded and detailed. It also may be that these comments regarding the 'limitations' of radio news were in fact references not to technological but institutional restrictions, such as the amount of time the stations alloted for newscasts, or beliefs regarding the attention span of the audience. In either case, the comments of these print journalists reveal that they operated under the assumption that there are inherent differences between written and spoken news, and that the 'limitations' of radio were set in stone -- whether the 'stone' be technological or cultural.

Critique of the Mode:

This theme of inherent differences between radio and newspapers was carried over into the articles in which print journalists criticised the mode of communication used on radio -- namely, the oral mode. The fact that radio news is spoken, not written, was apparently a matter of deep concern to some. These journalists made a number of statements about the ways in which they considered the spoken word to be inferior to the written word as a vehicle for transmitting important information. Starting from the premise that there are intrinsic and predetermined differences between oral and textual communication, print journats who were opposed to radio newscasting attempted to build a case that their own mode -- the written -- is best suited for the transmission of news.

With the advent of newscasting, some print journalists were quite worried that the public would stop buying newspapers in favor of radio news. In their debates about whether or not this scenario was likely, they frequently discussed the contrasts between the written and spoken communucation processes, speculating on the differences between reading and listening. These two means of absorbing information were compared on both the sensorial and practical levels. On the sensorial level, it was argued that taking in information visually is more more effective than doing so aurally, and that therefore newspapers are a better source of news than radio.

For example, as early as 1924, an editorial in Editor and Publisher stated definitively that "we do not believe that (radio) can possibly supplant the newspaper...because the sense of hearing does not satisfy the same intellectual craving as does the sense of reading (40). It is interesting to note here that the writer contrasts the "sense of hearing" with the "sense of reading", as if reading was a natural ability of the body rather than a skill that must be learned. Also of importance is the implication that reading is more directly linked with the intellect than listening, for as we have already seen, print journalists clearly felt that it was preferable to appeal to the intellect than the emotions. Several years later, the same viewpoint was voiced by the ANPA Radio Committee. In its 1931 report, the Committee stated definitively that radio could never become a true competitor of newspapers because "the eye and not the ear receives quick and lasting impressions" (41).

Another example comes from a 1930 article by Frank Stockbridge entitled "Radio vs. the Press" in the Outlook and Independent. He predicted that people would continue to buy newspapers despite radio news, because they "want to read about the big events", explaining that "most folk are eye-minded. They get only impressions through their ears; they get facts through their eyes" (42). Invoking a model

241

linking emotions and subjectivity with the ear, and cognition and objectivity with the eye, Stockbridge essentially suggested that the written mode is the best means by which to deliver the facts. This position might be deemed 'sensory determinism', claiming that we naturally receive certain types of information better through particular senses, and therefore messages must be shaped in accordance with the built-in limitations of the human sense organs. It implies that the printed word is superior to the spoken as a mode for the delivery of news because 'facts' can be better absorbed through the eyes than the ears, or that factual information is best trusted when it is seen rather than merely heard.

Some journalists extended this argument, suggesting that the spoken word appeals to the emotions of the listener, and thereby raises the danger that the radio audience might mistake a sensationalized speech or news report for actual fact. For example, in his Propaganda and the News, journalist Will Irwin warned that "the radio, through the magic inherent in the human voice, has means of appealing to the lower nerve centers and of creating emotions which the hearer mistakes for thoughts" (43). Just what it is that these nerve centers are "lower" than, we are not told, but this statement sounds much like other arguments which postulate the emotions as being somehow inferior to -- and thereby lower than -- the intellect. A similar concern with the audience's ability to discriminate fact from fiction while listening as opposed to reading was expressed by Mitchell Charnley in his handbook on radio news writing. He stressed the importance of "calm, factual presentation" of facts, explaining that faced with "overemphasis and sensationalizing", "the listener with his inaccurate ear is likely to add his own vivid imagination to sensational fact and come out with a vastly distorted view of the news" (44).

Some comments focused more on the practical as opposed to the sensorial differences between reading and listening. A number of articles argued that compared with the spoken word, the printed page offered the reader greater convenience and control over the information consumption process. It was pointed out that while listening to the radio, for example, one cannot stop the announcer and hear a newcast again -- nor is it possible to skip ahead to the portions of the news in which one is most interested. As early as 1926 an editorial in Editor and Publisher speculated that radio would never replace newspapers for the simple reason that

> a person will not sit patientily while a long list of market quotations are being read on the air to get the news concerning one or two stocks that he may be interested in when he may take his newspaper and turn to his particular interest without delay. (45).

Simiarly, writing for The New York Times in September of 1931, journalist Waldemar Kaempffert offered the following obervations on the subject: "we read and reread papers selectively. In broadcasting there is no chance for selection, no chance for a rehearing". He also invited the reader to imagine the entire contents of a daily newspaper being read over the air. Not only would this take hours, but, Kaempffert suggested, it is doubtful that anyone would "listen patiently until at last a news item of direct personal interest was reached" (46).

This theme was also voiced by the ANPA Radio Committee in 1925. In their report of that year the Committee speculated that radio would serve as a stimulus to newspaper circulation rather than a deterrent, because with radio "the listener must catch the message on the fly, but the reader can study, assimilate and preserve if he desires things of interest which he finds in the newspaper" (47). On the same note, Frank Miller, editor of the South Bend Tribune noted in 1933 that "to receive radio news one must be present when it is delivered", whereas, "the newspaper is present to be read whenever desired" (48). And in 1940, an article entitled "Radio versus Reading" in the New Republic observed that

> The reader chooses his own material and can come to it when he wishes; he can set his own pace. Everybody has a 'right' speed for himself in listening or reading. The reader can adjust to it, the listener cannot. The reader can reread and dwell on the passages that need it. There's less opportunity to think an argument through along with the broadcaster (49).

Comments of this nature continually portray the printed page as offering the reader far more freedom of choice and control over the news consumption process than is available in listening to news over the radio, thereby implying that the newspaper is a more desirable medium for the transmission of news.

Another way in which the spoken word was found disadvantageous for news presentation was its lack of permanence. At the time of the Press-Radio conflict, radio news was live, and no recordings were made of daily news broadcasts. Thus unlike the daily newspaper, there was no record of the precise nature of the news put out over the airwaves. The potential hazards associated with this evanesence were noted in several articles. The main threat, it seems, was in the arena of libel, ever an issue of concern for journalists. In June of 1928, an editorial in Editor and Publisher entitled "Libel Via Radio", described a hypothetical situation in which a news story might be read over the air, mistakenly charging a business with fradulent practices. In such a situtation, what course of action, the author asks, is available to those wrongly accused? "The spoken word has been sent forth to blacken their names, thousands hear it...but no permanent record remains to be challenged and corrected" (50).

Addressing the same issue a year later in an editorial on "News By Radio", the New York Times put the matter this way:

> The news item in the newspaper is a permanent record: if libelous or scandalous, there is a physical ownership and property from which to seek redress. The radio news item is a vibration in the air, without record, without visible responsibility, without that incentive to accuracy that comes with print. (51)

The implication here is that with radio, since no evidence is left behind after speaking on the air, one person could speak in an abusive way about another,without fear of being confronted with documentary proof of the slanderous statement. The victim, of course, would be left without recourse in the absence of a written record of the attack. The article seems to imply that it is the very presence of a written record that helps keep the newspaper honest. In addition, the writer argues that the audience trusts the printed account more than the oral delivery, explaining that "it is the habit of man (sic) to be more certain of the fact he sets down in script or print than of the report he merely repeats" (52). Voicing what was by this time a well-established bias against the reliability of the spoken word, this journalist speaks as a true member of print culture, seeingly unaware that for many centuries, in many parts of the world, people found ways to believe eachother before they were able to write things down.

Perhaps the clearest statement of the print journalists' position on the relative merits of the written as compared with the spoken word was made by Paul Williams, editor of The Utica Daily Press. In what was described as an "impromptu debate" that took place with Marlin Aylesworth, president of NBC, at the American Society of Newspaper Editors Convention in April of 1930, Williams argued that radio would never become a dominant medium of news and information because "precise information of any importance is best conveyed in print." Elaborating on this point, he explained that

> You don't want contracts, orders, specifications or any other significant statements left to somebody's say-so. For that reason -- there will be a large publication field for important fact-information which will continue until doctors are willing to give their prescriptions verbally -- which I think is a long time in the future. (53) (emph mine, g.j.)

Ironically, today doctors do give prescriptions over the telephone, and 'significant statements' are made over radio and television. But in the early 1930's, the idea of radio news was viewed, at least by some print journalists, as being as ridiculous as the idea of a verbal perscription -- both of which were seen as requiring documentation for credibility. In other words, the message here was that for something to be true it must be in print.

Finally, the preservative qualities of newspapers were attributed with the power to assist the continuation of western civilization itself. In April of 1936 Editor and Publisher ran an article by Samuel P. Weston, described in his by-line as a "Newspaper Analyst". Weston, like other journalists we have heard from, predicted that radio news would never replace the newspaper. In his case, the argument stemmed from the premise that newspapers were superior to radio for the purposes of news transmission because of the permanancy of print. "After all," Weston wrote, "it boils down to the consideration of what is the best medium", and explained that the "intrinsic function of the newspaper" is that of serving as a "permanent vehicle for the dissemination of news". He noted that while newspapers are "tangible, measurable" commodities that record news in a "permanent form", the radio is an "intangible, perishable and impermanent medium". The problem with this, according to Weston, is that "Civilization is founded on and depends for its existence on tangible records" (54). The logical extension of this argument, therefore, is that Civilization would continue only if news distribution remained in the hands of the newspapers. In Weston's view, it was precisely because newspapers were so essential to the preservation of civilization that they would never be displaced by radio. Print journalists who objected to radio news warned that in addition to lacking permanance, a message delivered orally was potentially subjective and inaccurate. In their view, these qualities rendered the oral mode inherently unsuited for the purposes of news delivery, thereby disqualifying radio as an acceptable medium for the transmission of news to the citizens of the nation. For these journalists, there was still only one mode that was appropriate for the job at hand, and that was the written mode -- the printed word -- carried to the people via the medium of the newspaper.

The journalists' 'solution' to the radio problem:

In this chapter we have heard the various ways in which print journalists felt that radio news was inferior to print news. The dilemma faced by the newspaper publising industry was this: despite their objections to radio newscasting, it very popular with the listening audience. The only way the publishers could retain control over the news dissemination process therefore, was to take over radio news, thus ensuring that news bulletins which went out over the airwaves were still being written by 'trained' newspaper reporters. This move was justified as protecting the public from the dangers of listening to radio news prepared by the 'inexperienced' broadcasters. As a 1931 editorial in Editor and Publisher put it, "it is bad journalism to abdicate the news function to an agency which has neither the newspaper tradition nor the safeguards of a printed record assembled by trained and responsible newspaper men" (55). The solution, it seems, was for 'trained and responsible newspaper men' to provide radio with the news. The theory, according Mr. Wilder, the San Fransisco manager of the California Newspaper Publisher's Association, was that "if the public demands spot broadcasting of news events, there is no agency better fitted to provide this than the newspapers, trained for generations in the gathering of news" (56). Similarly, in January of 1935, Edward Harris, chairman of the ANPA Radio Committee, expressed the opinion that the broadcasting station must speak "with the authority of the regularly organized news agencies, which are universally accepted sources of authentic news", and had years of experience in the "the collection, assembling and distribution of accurate, reliable and unbiased news" (57).

For the anti-radio publishers, the approach to dealing with the situation was fairly clear -- they were willing to allow news broadcasting to take place, so long as they were at the helm. "Radio", said Mr. Atwood of the Gannett papers, "should be made a handmaiden" (58) to the press. And indeed, the role of 'handmaiden' was exactly what was created for the broadcasters with the establishment of the Press Radio Bureau in March of 1934. The details of the Biltmore agreement specified that radio news was to be restricted to brief bulletins supplied by the major wire service organizations. This meant that radio news would essentialy consist of the oral delivery of newspaper text, which would insure that the newscasts would conform to the print journalists' standards of dispassionate, objective and accurate news reporting.

Discussing the establishment of the Press-Radio Bureau, radio commentator Boake Carter remembered that the publishers had justified the arrangements on the grounds that this would provide the public with "real, authentic, proper news" (59). In May of 1934 the Radio Committee of the ANPA issued a report which praised the Bureau as lessening "the danger of promiscuous broadcasting of unreliable and inaccurate news" (60). The following year the chairman of that committee, Edward Harris, emphasized that "important news bulletins should be supplied to the broadcasters by the newspapers in order that the general public may enjoy complete protection on news obtained from reliable sources" (61). And in the spring of 1936, The New York Times described the Press-Radio Bureau as supplying "authenticated news gathered by the newspapers and press associations for broadcasting on the air" (62). The overall message of these comments is that only with the help of the print journalists would the accuracy of radio news be insured.

Conclusion:

In summary, the Press-Radio War was, in part, an effort on the part of anti-radio journalists to protect the boundaries of their professional domain. They argued that with untrained newscasters would come radio news that was sensational and lacked objectivity. In essence these newsmen predicted that if radio entered what had previous been their exclusive domain -- the gathering and disseminating of the nation's news -- the standards of professional journalism would be violated. Since these standards provide journalists with their cultural legitimacy and authority, the print journalists perceived the radio announcers as a threat to the reputation of all journalists. In an effort to protect the image and reputation of their own profession and thereby preserve the cultural authority they enjoy as the gatherers and interpretors of the nation's news, the print journalists tried to retain control over the news dissemination process by trying to remake radio news into a spoken version of the newspaper. They justified this self-interested plan by invoking the rhetoric of objectivity and proessional ethics, warning that unless the press alone handled the news it would become unreliable and inaccurate, posing considerable dangers to the public interest.

REFERENCES

1. Eric Barnouw, The Golden Web: A History of Broadcasting in the United States 1933-1953 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

   Edwin Emery, History of the Association of Newspaper Publishers Association Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1950.

   Frank Luther Mott, American Journalism: A History 1690-1960 NY:MacMillan, 1962.

2. Frank Stockbridge. "News Broadcasting and The Newspapers", American Press, October 1934, p. 1.

3. Ibid.

4. "Reporters Needed", Editor and Publisher, June 29, 1929

5. "California Publishers Propose to Operate Radio Stations" Editor and Publisher, July 11, 1931, p 46

6. "Crime on the Waves", New Outlook Feburary 1935, p 50

7. "Spot News and Radio", Editor and Publisher, March 26, 1932

8. "Unparalleled Response by Press and Public Met Lindbergh Climax", Editor and Publisher, May 21, 1932.

9. Marlen Pew, "Shop Talk at Thirty", Editor and Publisher, May 28, 1932, p 44.

10. "Radio Reporting of Chicago Fire Called Hysterical by Press", Editor and Publisher, May 26, 1934, p 30.

11. "Quake Coverage Hampered by Radio" Editor and Publisher, March 18, 1933, p 7.

12. Roger Burlingame, Don't Let THem Scare You: The Life and Times of Elmer Davis. Philadelphia: JB Lippincott, 1961.

13. Rudoph Michael, "History and Criticism of Press-Radio Relationships". Journalism Quarterly, Vol 1, 1938, p 178

14. "Spot News and Radio", Editor and Publisher, March 26, 1932.

15. "Association of Newspaper Publishers Radio Committee Report", May 3, 1934.

16. "Publishers Oppose Gallery Rights for Radio Reporters" Editor and Publisher, December 2 1933.

17. "Five Point Program Urged on Radio" Editor and Publisher, April 29, 1933.

18. "Editors Warn Radio on News Broadcasts" Editor and Publisher, January 31, 1931.

19. "Spot News and Radio", Editor and Publisher, March26, 1932.

20. Karl Bikel, "Radio' Needs Radio' Men", American Press, August 1936.

21 "Here, You Take the Mike! Says Pasadena Star News", American Press, 1931.

22. "Irresponsible Radio News", Editor and Publisher, May 26, 1934.

23. "Press Held to Have No Air Priority" Editor and Publisher, July 11, 1936.

24. "GOP COnvention Machine Whirls in Open", Editor and Publisher, June 16, 1928.

25. Larry King Live, TV Show, June 17, 1989.

26. "Radio Reporting of Chicago Fire Called 'Hysterical' by Press" Editor and Publisher, May 26, 1931, p. 30.

27. Mitchell Charnley, News BY Radio, New York: MacMillan, 1948, p. 106.

28. Ibid.

29. Ibid, p 107.

30. "The Radio Question", Editor and Publisher, December 22, 1928, p. 74

31. "Radio in Politics", Editor and Publisher, November 19, 1932.

32. ANPA Bulletin, January 6, 1933.

33. George Brandenburg, "Says Radio and Press Have Own Fields To Serve", Editor and Publisher, August 10, 1940.

34. Frank Stockbridge, op. cit.

35. Frank Arnold, "Radio and the Newspapers", Editor and Publisher, May 1, 1937, p. 20.

36. "Says We Are Linked in Latin America", New York Times, June 28, 1931, p.2.

37. "Giving News to Radio Viewed as Menace to Newspapers by Many Editors", *Editor and Publisher*, December 22, 1928, p. 44.

38. "Radio News Service", *Editor and Publisher*, September 30, 1933, p 32.

39. Frank Miller, "No Fear of Radio", *American Press*, December 1932.

40. "Returns by Radio" *Editor and Publisher*, November 8, 1924, p 22.

41. "Publishers Warned of Radio Dangers", *Editor and Publisher*, April 25, 1931, p. 19.

42. Frank Stockbridge, "Radio vs. The Press: Will the Newspapers Control Broadcasting?" *Outlook and Independent*, December 31, 1930, p 692.

43. Will Irwin, *Propaganda and The News: or, What Makes You Think So?*, New York: Whittlesbey House, McGraw Hill, 1936, p. 252.

44. Charnley, op.cit, p 61.

45. "Radio and Circulation" *Editor and Publisher*, October 23, 1926, p. 32.

46. Waldemar Kaempffert, "From Telegraph to Television - and Beyond", *New York Times*, Sept 13, 1931, X:4:8.

47. ANPA Report of the Committee on Radio *Editor and Publisher*, April 25, 1925.

48. Frank Miller, "No Fear of Radio" *American Press*, December 1933

49. Edwin Muller, "Radio versus Reading", *New Republic*, February 19, 1940.

50. "Libel via Radio" *Editor and Publisher*, June 16, 1928

51. "News by Radio" *New York Times*, April 19, 1929, 24:3.

52. Ibid.

53. "Editor and NBC Chief Discuss Radio", *Editor and Publisher*, April 26,, 1930, p. 31.

54. Samuel Weston, "Radio No Serious Menace", *Editor and Publisher*, April 18, 1936, p. 29.

55. "Radio Competition" *Editor and Publisher*, January 17, 1931, p. 7

56. "California Publishers Propose to Operate Radio Stations", *Editor and Publisher*, July 11, 1931, p. 46.

57. Edward Harris, "Radio and the Press" *Annals of the American Academy*, 1935, p 164.

58. "Editor and NBC Chief Discuss Radio", *Editor and Publisher*, Aril 26, 1930, p. 31.

59. "Hits Newspaper Control of Radio", *Editor and Publisher*, October 3, 1936

60. *ANPA Bulletin*, May 3, 1934, p. 289.

61. Harris, op cit.

62. "Press Fight Urged to Keep Radio Free from Censorship", *New York Times*, April 24, 1936, p. 1.

A Rebel By Any Other Name:
Herbert Matthews and The New York Times' Coverage of the Battle of Guadalajara

by
Aldo Svaldi
University of Missouri

ABSTRACT: Herbert Matthews served as a New York Times correspondent on the Republican side in the Spanish Civil War. He claims that The Times failed to be the paper of record for the war and that the copy desk often distorted his dispatches as to make them historically inaccurate. A comparison between Matthew's dispatches from the Battle of Guadalajara, March 1937, and the articles as they appeared in The Times support his contention.

INTRODUCTION

If one newspaper could be named as the paper of record in the United States, it would probably be The New York Times. The paper's hard-earned reputation has won its microfilm copies a home in libraries across the nation. Perhaps the welcomes have come too easily, to the exclusion of other reputable papers. Back in 1969, William Taft warned about the overuse of The Times as a resource. Because its reputation and thorough index have helped make it ubiquitous, novice researchers often turn to it first, and unfortunately last.[1]

Taft commends the paper and then cautions researchers against putting all their eggs in The New York Times or any other single basket. Quoting Norman H. Pearson, he writes that the press is valid in historical research, "if for no other reason than that a newspaper represents what the public knows about any event. It is, therefore, a datum if not the entire truth. A newspaper account is controlled; so is any individual's. It is partial; therefore one reads many newspapers in research."[2]

Catherine L. Covert in "'Jumbled, Disparate and Trivial': Problems in the Use of Newspapers as Historical Evidence," writes for the 80s, when growing databases, computerized indexes and the opening of morgues and archives have increased the availability of press accounts as historical resources. But the greater access has also increased the need for caution.[3]

Traditionally, historians have looked for a congruence between newspaper accounts and the events or people they portray, "a xerox copy of reality."[4] Covert says contemporary scholarship demands deeper interpretations. In itself, news contains and creates its own reality, unique but intrinsically linked to what it portrays. External influences interact with the values of sources, reporters, editors and society to shape the "news reality."

To sort out these external elements, Covert recommends a process she calls "triangulation." By bringing to bear other specific independent versions of an event, it becomes possible to get "a firmer fix on elusive elements in the historic environment--economic, technological or sociocultural--that shape the news."[5] Often a reporter's memoirs or a source's diary are the only alternatives available. On rare occasions when they can be found, a reporter's original notes are best, she says.[6]

The New York Times coverage of the Spanish Civil War lends itself well to triangulation, a process that avoids the pitfalls inherent in viewing newspapers as raw and undistilled history. Years after a conflict, when passions have died, the accounts often become separated from the values that gave them birth. Biases from supporters on each side and even those claiming neutrality taint coverage in subtle ways. Following traditional assumptions of historical research, it might be tempting to see such articles as damaged goods. But if articles are allowed their own separate realities, Covert says they can reveal much as "texts to popular systems of belief."[7]

Herbert Matthews, The Times' correspondent covering the Spanish Civil War on the Government side, disowned many of his articles, claiming editorial tampering had rendered them inaccurate.[8] Matthews had a degree in Italian Medieval studies, and had an acute concern about writing for history. He says he was greatly disheartened when his own editor doubted or even rejected his first-hand accounts of events. He expected skepticism from overt partisans of the opposite side, who denounced him regularly,[9] but the lack of faith from his editors at The New York Times' copy desk led him to almost resign more than once.[10]

> ...the truth suffered. No student can go back to the files of The New York Times from July 1936 to April 1939 and get a competent, balanced, complete journalistic picture of the Spanish Civil War. The Times failed its readership and posterity because although it gave them much, it could have given them more and better.[11]

Matthews still held this conviction 34 years after the war ended, when he filed copies of all his dispatches in the Journalism Library of Columbia University. "I want my work on the Spanish Civil War to be judged by them, not by what was printed under my by-line in The New York Times."[12]

Of the many events Matthews covered during the war, the treatment of his dispatches from the Battle of Guadalajara during March 1937 seems to caused the greatest conflict with the home office. The battle's coverage works well as a case for Covert's triangulation process. Looking at what various historians say happened at the battle, comparing their accounts with the articles that appeared in The Times, and last contrasting the final articles with what Matthews originally wrote, this paper will examine to what extent Matthews' dispatches were altered. Are Matthew's dispatches historically more reliable than The Times articles? Beyond the questions of journalistic and historical match are those of values. What messages do the changes in Matthew's copy communicate in and of themselves, and do they shed light on the difficulties both correspondents in the field and editors at home face in any ideologically divisive war?[13]

BACKGROUND

Matthews came to Spain after an arduous stint covering the Italian conquest of Abyssinia. He replaced his colleague, and later rival, William P. Carney, who had become unwelcome in Madrid and would soon be covering the Rebel side. Carney's somewhat forced departure highlights how the Spanish Civil War raised ideological passions to a then unequaled pitch. It drew not only the attention, but the participation of Europeans and Americans. At its core, the war began and ended as a blood feud of a divided Spain. But on another level, it became Europe's battle ground as anti-fascist Italians fought Mussolini's blackshirts, and Nazi bombers strafed exiled communist Germans. French, British, American, Mexican, East European and Scandinavian volunteers aided the Spanish government. The Soviets provided weapons, organization skills and military officers. The Spanish Foreign Legion, Moroccans, Portuguese, Irish, Italians and Germans volunteered or were sent, together with weapons, to help the Rebels under General Franco.

Officially the U.S. government claimed neutrality. Most Americans were preoccupied with domestic concerns and remained ardent isolationists. Among those who took an interest, opinion was divided, mostly in favor of the Spanish Republic, but with a sizable minority of Roman Catholics and conservatives supporting General Franco and the rebellion.[14]

In such a heated conflict, it is easy to imagine how neutrality became one of the first victims, especially among correspondents. Frederick R. Benson says objective or nonpartisan reporting during this war dropped to an all time low. While the Rebels refused correspondents from liberal media, the Government (Loyalists) rejected reporters from newspapers on the right. Both sides censored without compunction, though restrictions were somewhat stricter with the Insurgents. Lengthy editorials and eyewitness accounts attempted to give an air of careful analysis, Benson says, but only served as a disguise for "extremely biased journalism."[15]

George Orwell, a correspondent in the war, had these disparaging remarks about the press. "Early in life I had noticed that no event is ever correctly reported in a newspaper, but in Spain, for the first time, I saw newspaper reports which did not bear any relations to the facts, not even the relationship which is implied in an ordinary lie."[16]

Though less given to the extreme Orwell mentions, even The Times was split among those with sympathies for each side and a third group seeking to maintain the old rules of impartiality. The latter group, which included publisher Arthur Hays Sulzberger and managing editor Edwin James, often found itself caught in the cross fire. Sulzberger, in an address on January 20, 1938, highlights the difficulties involved in walking a "middle" path:

> The Times' coverage of the Spanish conflict... seems to me an outstanding case history for students of journalism. Strangely enough, it is not the censors on either side in Spain who cause most of the difficulties-- even though they cause plenty. It is the folks on the sidelines, the partisans of one side or the other... Their excited denunciation is nothing short of amazing.[17]

Among those supporting the Republic, Matthews became a hero. Among some Catholics, including those on the copy desk, Matthews says he became anathema.[18] Early in the war, extremists on the Republican side took advantage of the reactionary uprising to launch their own revolution. They unleashed long-held animosities by murdering hundreds of Catholic clergy and burning and looting countless churches.

Many Roman Catholics remained deeply offended long after the Government restored order and the killings stopped. Gay Talese in The Kingdom and the Power highlights how this animosity may have influenced the copy editors, or the "bullpen" as they were known.

> The bullpen was lightly styled the 'Catholic bullpen' within the office, and though no one could prove it, Neil MacNeil, Raymond H. McCaw and others were said to reflect a Catholic viewpoint when appraising the news, with the results ranging from the playing down of stories about birth control to the playing up of stories expressing alarm over communism.[19]

A vocal segment of Catholic readers labeled Matthews a communist and demanded his resignation--a startling reversal considering months earlier a communist organization had called him a fascist for his "pro-Italian" reports from Ethiopia.[20] But it would be unfair to say Catholics alone were overtly partisan, for many liberal democrats and socialists were equally zealous. Matthews himself does not deny his lack of objectivity, and emphasizes that any feeling person could not remain neutral.[21] In his later writings, he continually reasserts the justness of the Republican cause, though he admits his sympathies might have been elsewhere had he covered the Rebels. Regardless, he does not view subjectivity as a hindrance provided a reporter is dedicated to the truth. He says he pulled no punches because of his sympathy, and wrote only what he witnessed first hand or what he after careful examination believed to be true. "The newspaperman cannot be asked not to have a bias; he can only be asked to tell the whole truth as he sees it. If he does so he will provide the material for history."[22]

LITERATURE REVIEW

What kind of distortions would the unwitting researcher come across if he or she relied on the paper as a primary source? Matthews, though eventually reconciled with his employer, did not let the issue die and mentions his frustrations in his memoirs, especially Half Of Spain Died and A World in Revolution. Did The New York Times fail or was Matthews simply blinded by partisan bias? The strongest advocates of the first position are Matthews and Robert L. Barber. Barber, in his thesis "The Politics of Journalism" compares the dispatches to the printed articles and concludes that a deliberate conspiracy lead to their distortion.[23] Dudley Quentin Althaus, who has written a narrative thesis on Matthews' involvement in Spain, disagrees with Barber. Althaus cites Talese and attributes the changes in copy to an all-too-human and flawed institution that was trying to be fair, and that "sometimes without reason or design things just happened at The Times."[24]

Of all the battles Matthews covered in the Spanish Civil War, Guadalajara presents perhaps the greatest discrepancy between the dispatches sent and the articles printed. The intent of this paper is not to point blame or to absolve, nor to necessarily find a happy medium between Barber's conspiracy and Althaus' bungling theories. It is not enough to compare the dispatches to the articles, because there may be flaws in both. An outside arbitrator is needed. As a standard or base leg for the triangulation process, an outside historical account can help determine whether Matthews had legitimate complaints or was blinded by his own sympathies.[25]

262

THE BASE LEG: HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

Though they differ on exact numbers, historians such as Hugh Thomas, George Hills and John Coverdale for the most part agree about the events of the Battle of Guadalajara and the extent of Italian involvement. The impetus for the battle came almost entirely from the Italian side. After General Franco failed four separate times to capture Madrid and bring an early end to the war, Italian General Roatta asked permission to lead an attack.[26]

Franco was not pleased, since the Italian divisions sent by Mussolini were not under his full command. John Coverdale recounts a note Franco sent to Roatta's Chief of Staff, Colonel Faldella:

> When all is said and done, Italian troops have been sent here without asking my authorization. First I was told that companies of volunteers were coming to be included in Spanish battalions. Then I was asked to form Italian battalions and I agreed. Next, senior officers and generals arrived to command them and finally already-formed units began to arrive. Now you want to force me to allow these troops to fight together under General Roatta's orders, when my plans were quite different... The usefulness of these troops is greatly reduced by the requirement that they always be used together.[27]

Franco finally conceded to an Italian attack north of Madrid, as an upper pincer in a move to encircle the city. Of the four divisions assembled, three were Blackshirts(fascist) and one was regular Italian Army. Together they numbered between 31,000 to 35,000 men and were equipped with Italian weapons and led by Italian officers. Italian generals drew up the battle plans and led the attack.[28]

About 15,000 Spaniards and Moors, the Soria Division under General Moscardo, were to remain behind and protect the Italian right flank as it advanced. A spearhead of the mechanized 2nd Italian division opened the battle on March 8 from the town of Siguenza. They easily broke through the outnumbered Republican 12th Division. Moscardo's troops also participated in the original advance, but soon stopped. The Italians captured the towns of Trijueque and Brihuega before meeting stiff resistance. On March 12 their momentum was slowed by the International Brigades, Soviet tanks under General Kleber, and bombing from the Republican airforce. The other two Italian divisions were rotated in, and the battle continued for five days along the highway leading to Guadalajara.

Constant bombing demoralized the virtually unprotected Italian ranks. By March 18, the Italian troops were on the run. Loyalist soldiers tried to keep up, but couldn't. To save a total rout, Moscardo's Spaniards and Moors moved up between March 22-27 and halted the Republican counterattack.[29]

Thomas estimates that the Italians may have had 3,000 killed, 4,000 wounded and about 800 taken prisoners. Moscardo's losses were insignificant, indicating that Franco's troops saw comparatively little action.[30] It was primarily an Italian-planned, armed, and directed campaign. After March 22 the troops could be legitimately called Insurgent, but before that they were primarily Italian. The presence of an Italian army on Spanish soil was in direct violation of Article 10 in the League of Nations Covenant.[31] It also violated the intent of the Nonintervention Agreement which prohibited outside nations from sending arms or troops to either side. Only volunteers were supposed to be fighting. Italy, Britain, France, the U.S.S.R., and Germany had signed this agreement in an attempt to prevent a larger world war.[32]

LEGS TWO AND THREE: DISPATCHES AND ARTICLES[33]

The historical accounts point to Italy's relatively large intervention on behalf of General Franco. As the events unfolded, however, the extent of the Italian presence was not so certain, and it became the focus of a running disagreement between Matthews and The Times' editors. Matthews covered the battle from it inception, and he reported from recaptured territory once the Loyalists launched their successful counterattack. Early on the printed articles retain Matthew's references to Italian involvement. But soon modifiers, such as "Italians, fighting as Rebels" creep into the copy. By the March 15 article, "Italians" is replaced by the word "Rebel." There is a reprieve, until March 21, where Italians is replaced by the more generic and in this case largely inaccurate Rebels or Insurgents some 12 times. The table below summarizes the number of times Italian(s) is mentioned in Matthews' dispatches and in the final articles that appear in the microfilm edition of The Times. It also shows the number of times "Rebels/Insurgents" replaces "Italian(s)."

Date of Article	Mention of Italian(s) in dispatch	in NYT	Rebel/Insurgent(s) replaces Italian(s)
March 9	1	1	0
March 10	8	4	0
March 11	11	11	0
March 12	13	12	0
March 13	8	9	0
March 14	17	17	0
March 15	21	14	2
March 16	3	4	0
March 17	18	18	0
March 18	4	4	0
March 19	9	4	2
March 20	11	11	0
March 21	19	3	12
March 22	9	2	2
March 23	3	2	1
March 24*	17	11	0
March 25	2	3	0
March 26	0	0	0

*=incomplete dispatch

In Matthews' first account of the battle, March 9, he clearly states, "there is no reason to believe yet that German or Italian troops are being used there except perhaps as officers and technicians." On March 10, Matthews leads with a quote from General Miaja, commander of the Loyalist army defending Madrid, that a whole division of Italian soldiers under an Italian general is involved. Miaja based this claim in part on interviews with Italian prisoners. At the end of his dispatch, Matthews summarizes what three Italian prisoners told Miaja, but those 11 lines are cut out of the final story.

Editing through March 14 is on the whole minor. The March 11 story is run with Matthews' statement that the military tactics being used are clearly Italian and that "in a sense the government is fighting an Italian expeditionary force." Attention during this week was also focused on the implementation of an agreement reached by England, France, Italy and Germany, with the reluctant approval of the Soviet Union, to patrol the coast and borders of Spain. The intent was to prevent outside troops and weapons from reaching the belligerents. To the Republicans fighting an Italian army of 30,000 and being bombed by German planes, the plan was a farce that would only benefit the Rebels, and they said as much in their newspapers. Matthews passed these comments along, but the editors did not care for them and they were cut.

After the nonintervention patrol began, the editing on Matthews' copy tightens. Before March 14, The Times runs almost all of Matthews' references to Italian troops, even headlining his March 12 story, "30,000 Italians Fighting." In the March 15 story, "Italian forces" is replaced by "Rebel forces" in the lead. For Americans, a comparable situation might be if the British had sent 30,000 soldiers under their own officers to fight for the Confederacy, and European newspapers had simply called them Rebels. The point of the entire story is changed and diluted. Likewise, a phrase describing the town of Brihuega as "where one Italian division has had headquarters" is taken out. The Blackshirt Dio lo Vuole Division did use the city as a base of operations, according to historian George Hills.

On March 16, "Rebel forces, chiefly Italians" replaces Italians. In stories from March 17 and 19, the noun Italians is given a gerund, "fighting as Spanish rebels" which Matthews did not originally include. A general distancing seems to be taking place, but on March 20 it reverses itself. Whoever worked the Friday night desk on March 13 and 20 edits much less obtrusively, hardly changing the dispatch at all. Kept were "...all the insurgent soldiers were Italians," and "Yesterday's victory, the second for the Loyalists against exclusively Italians troops..."

For whatever reason it slipped by, the March 20 article is a still moment before a storm of alterations. On March 21, Matthews' story "Rebels Abandon Vast War Stocks" appeared on page one. The lead was changed from "The Italian Army of 4 division has been routed," to "The 4 divisions of Rebels who attempted a drive on Madrid from the Northeast, reported to have been chiefly Italians, have been routed." In eleven separate cases, "Rebels" or "Insurgents" replaces "Italian", while "enemy" is substituted in once. It appears that the copy editor(s) went through the dispatch weeding out any references to Italian(s). Sentences left out include "every town we passed through was full of Italian material" and the descriptive, "all day, at every place we stopped and no matter whom we talked to or what we saw, there was only one label--Italian. The dead bodies, the prisoners, the material of every kind, the men who had occupied Brihuega and then fled were Italian and nothing but Italian."

The last line, especially the last phrase in its changed form, "were Insurgents and nothing but Insurgents" has gained almost legendary status. It is mentioned in the Kingdom and the Power[34] as well as Phillip Knightley's The First Casualty.[35] The line as edited makes Matthews sound foolish. Although it may have been included in the first edition as Matthews claims, the later edition from which the microfilm was made does not include the paragraph.

Editing in the next two days isn't as extreme, but it follows the new precedence. The retreat is halted by March 23, when the Loyalists confront Moscardo's troops, sent to replace the tired Italians. Matthews returns to calling the troops "Insurgent" in his dispatches, after it is clear the Italians have withdrawn from the front. On March 24, Matthews introduces the arguments the Government will use before the

Nonintervention Committee to protest Italy's actions. His words shows his concern for the historical record mentioned earlier, "...it is important that the government's case be placed impartially before newspaper readers, both to remove present confusion and provide future historians with a basis for their interpretations." The editors changed this to, "The government holds that the recent offensive was an Italian affair and it gives this basis for its position:...."

After briefly outlining the government's case, Matthews describes in detail how it isn't propaganda by corroborating it with his own eyewitness accounts. Matthews spoke Italian and was familiar with Italian army tactics from his time in Abyssinia. He had spoken with the prisoners, read captured documents, seen the weapons and vehicles left behind. He repeats the outlined points, but this time with his eyewitness accounts. All twenty lines were cut. Matthews does temper his comments by saying that in Madrid they don't know what the other side of the story is. That sentence is left in. As the battle of Guadalajara ended, another was heating up between Matthews and New York, particularly McCaw and James.

DISCUSSION

The comparison of the dispatches and articles shows no consistent pattern that might support Barber's notion of a conspiracy. Although "neutralization" increases in the dispatches as the evidence of Italian intervention becomes more irrefutable, the article that appears on the 20th is left almost intact. The harsh treatment of the article on the 21st is perhaps a reaction to this. If there were a consistent desire to cover-up based on a pro-Franco stance, it would logically have begun much earlier. Several of the dispatches passed through with no or only minor changes. However, the dispatches on the weekend received more severe editing than those appearing during the week.

Yet if it is not a pro-Franco conspiracy, it definitely is not a coincidence without something of managing editor James' blessing, as Althaus suggests.

> Although James became a principal actor in the controversy over Guadalajara and at other times, it must be understood that he learned the actions of the bullpen only after the fact. Under James, the various departments operated with a measure of autonomy. The bullpen was in charge throughout the night--when the overseas cables generally arrived--as James left the office at 6 p.m.[36]

Granted, the changes on March 15 might have slipped by James, but later ones most likely did not occur without his awareness. As Talese highlights, the Catholic sympathies of the bullpen probably influenced how Matthews' copy was edited, especially as the case for Italian intervention became more damning. On a basic level, this may explain some of the inconsistencies. Dispatches that passed through untouched were likely edited by Matthews allies on the cable desk. But with the exception of the March 20 article, editing of the copy seems to follow measured steps of increasing alterations.

A more likely possibility is that James, trying to take the "moderate" position, allowed the changes in Matthews copy in order to protect the viability of nonintervention. Support for this is found in the three editorial columns he wrote on Spain during the month. Appearing in the "Week In Review Section," these columns seem to highlight a progressive defense of nonintervention and a slighting of the Italian involvement. The first on nonintervention ran March 14, together with a column from Matthews. Paragraphs in Matthews' original copy that showed the strongest disagreement with James or that contradicted his basic premises on nonintervention were removed. James' column on the 21st in particular seems almost an apologetic for the way Matthews' dispatches were edited. It becomes especially poignant when one is aware of the conflict taking place within the newsroom. In the piece, James claims that there are 30,000 French men fighting in Loyalist Spain for the International Brigades and that he considers the Italians fighting at Guadalajara volunteers and not an expeditionary force.

> When an insurgent force in which Italians predominate is defeated, it is a moot question whether one should say Italians or Insurgents were defeated.... Certainly, it should be pointed out that the Italians in Spain are not there officially by Rome. They are not regular troops, but volunteers, technically."[37]

Historian Hugh Thomas writes that the Littorio Division present at the battle was not a volunteer force, but "had been put together out of conscripted men, laborers who had desired to go to Abyssinia, many of them in their thirties or older, some not knowing where they were going to...."[38] In a cynical way, James was right, according to the definition of volunteer as accepted by the Nonintervention Committee. A volunteer in its view was a "non-Spanish combatant."[39] But James was wrong in equating the role the French played to what Italy was doing under Mussolini.

For Matthews, the question of what to call the Italian troops was hardly moot as James claimed. He exchanged a series of messages with New York. Raymond McCaw, assistant managing editor, received assurances from Carney on the Nationalist side that the attacking army was not Italian, and insinuated that Matthews was sending, "obvious propaganda."[40] Matthews went directly to James concerning this challenge to his credibility, only to receive a "weaseling, extraneous reply (that) was hardly satisfactory."[41] In an April 11 letter Matthews sums up the situation as he views it:

> ...The question is solely that when an accredited correspondent says he saw something with his own eyes, you must believe him--or else discharge him. To give just one instance in this story: I said an officer approached with a stack of Italian documents under his arm (it being quite obvious that he showed them to me and I examined them all finding them to be genuine Italian stuff), and it was changed in The Times to Insurgent documents. That, in short, is nothing but a refusal to trust your own correspondent--a deliberate lack of faith which you surely must realize is intolerable... But it would only belabor the point, which is either that you trust your correspondent more than you do his competitors or his editors 3,000 miles away, or else you ask for your correspondent's resignation. You cannot expect the staff to keep their faith in the organization when their loyalty is met by lack of loyalty in New York.[42]

Some serious ethical questions are raised by the alteration of the dispatches. As Matthews mentions there is the issue of trusting a credible correspondent. But perhaps of greater concern to historians is the issue of specificity. Journalists, when choosing between a specific term and nonspecific one, tend to go with the one that provides more detail. On 18 separate occasions, copy editors replaced a more specific and accurate word with one that was less specific and most historians would agree inaccurate. On principle if nothing else, the Italian army that fought at Guadalajara was not an Insurgent force but an expeditionary force, paid for and sent by Mussolini.

The Times' policy of underplaying Italian involvement is a sticky one. Judging by James' editorials, the desire to give nonintervention a chance probably was the deciding factor. If Talese is correct about the "Catholic bullpen," James' stance was compounded by McCaw's willingness to doubt Matthews' more startling claims and to edit in favor of the Rebels. James readily defends the actions of the "bullpen" in his correspondence with Matthews and with the publisher, Sulzberger. Matthews, disturbed by the inequities and hypocrisy in nonintervention, was probably anxious to expose Italian involvement, though there is no sign he did so at the expense of his journalistic integrity and accuracy. The intent of the Republican government was to hold out long enough until a larger world war broke out and the democracies would send military help.

The Times' desire to give nonintervention a chance seems to have superceded other journalistic considerations. The tense political situation, together with conflicting reports from Rome, may have provided some justification in James' mind, but from a historical and journalistic viewpoint, Matthews correctly reported the facts available to him. The articles were "damaged" not by Matthew's subjectivity, but in New York.

CONCLUSION

A strength of Covert's triangulation process is that newspaper accounts need not be "xerox" copies of reality to be useful to researchers. If one leg is weak, the other two can still support the structure and provide damage control. Covert's method seems especially suited to gatekeeper studies. A conflict in historical and newspaper accounts need not lead to a complete rejection of the latter. Serious questions arise however when there is not at least one reliable standard to judge the information.

Using the triangulation process, the historical record and Matthews' dispatches are in greater agreement. Some possible political, social and journalistic values resulting in the alteration of Matthew's dispatches have been given, but a more detailed examination is needed. A pro-Franco bias arising from religious values on the part of some copy editors, a desire to shore up non-intervention on the part of the managing editor, and the long distances between the front and the newsroom may have all lead to the distrust of Matthew's accounts. Other contributing factors include Matthew's sympathy for the Republican cause, and the divisive environment of censorship and mistrust fostered in the war.

Clearly, the weak leg consists of the articles that appeared in The Times, the ones scholars and students would rest on as they scanned through microfilm. But an easy pitfall is to assume that present awareness equals past knowledge. Those changing Matthew's copy may have sincerely believed they were doing the "truthful" or "best" thing, based on their knowledge at the time.

Regardless, the greater risk for historians is in making past errors present errors. Just as monks of old copied mistakes as well as Scripture, so today it is possible to continue transmitting inaccuracies made permanent by print. Technology can not catch what careful scholarship doesn't. However, Covert offers an alternative. The past--its truths, errors and everything in between--can be made present knowledge.

ENDNOTES

[1] William Taft, Newspapers as Tools for Historians, (Columbia, MO: Lucas Brothers, 1970), 46.

[2] Ibid., 38.

[3] Catherine L. Covert, "'Jumbled, Disparate and Trivial': Problems in the Use of Newspapers as Historical Evidence." Paper presented to the AEJMC, (Syracuse: Newhouse School of Public Communications, 1981), 6-12.

[4] Ibid., 17.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., 18.

[7] Ibid., 17.

[8] Herbert Matthews, A World in Revolution, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), 39.

[9] "Catholic Journalists Threaten An Honest Reporter," The Christian Century, 12 July 1939, 868.

[10] A World in Revolution, 19.

[11] Ibid., 40.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Covert, 18.

[14] Herbert Matthews, Half of Spain Died, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973), 173.

[15] Frederick R. Benson, Writers in Arms: The Literary Impact of the Spanish Civil War, (New York: New York University Press, 1967), 90.

[16] Ibid.

[17] A World in Revolution, 19.

[18] Phillips Knightley, The First Casualty, (New York: Harvest Books, 1975), 198-199.

[19] Gay Talese, The Kingdom and the Power, (New York: World Publishing, 1969), 58.

[20] Ibid., 54.

[21] Herbert Matthews, Dispatches to the New York Times of the Spanish Revolution, introduction, (New York: Columbia University Journalism Library, 1973), 1.

[22] Dispatches, 1.

[23] Dudley Quentin Althaus, "A Correspondent's Commitment: Herbert L. Matthews' Coverage of the Spanish Civil War 1936- 1939," M.A. diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1984, 9.

[24] Althaus, 9.

[25] Covert, 18.

[26] John Coverdale, "The Battle of Guadalajara," Journal of Contemporary History, January 1974, 54.

[27] Ibid., 55.

[28] Hugh Thomas, The Spanish Civil War, (New York: Harper), 1961, 596.

[29] George Hills, The Battle For Madrid, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977), 128-134.

[30] Thomas, 601.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid., 581.

[33] Dispatches, v. II, March 1937, and Herbert Matthews, The New York Times, 9 March - 26 March, 1937.

[34] Talese, 58.

[35] Knightley, 198-199.

[36] Althaus, 101-102.

[37] Edwin James, "Mussolini's Prestige Questioned in Spain," The New York Times, 21 March 1937, 3E.

[38] Thomas, 597.

[39] Half of Spain Died, 135.

[40] A World in Revolution, 26.

[41] Ibid., 28.
[42] Ibid.

FROM JOURNALISM HISTORY TO LABOR HISTORY:
PROBLEMS AND NEW DIRECTIONS
IN THE LABOR HISTORY OF THE NEWSPAPER

by

Yung-Ho Im
School of Journalism and Mass Communication
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
(319) 335-5836

Paper Presented to History Division
AEJMC Annual Conference, Minneapolis, MN
August 9-12, 1990

From Journalism History to Labor History: Problems and New Directions in the Labor History of the Newspaper

ABSTRACT

This paper critically examines the literature on the history of newswork and suggests directions for a new labor history of the newspaper. While traditional business history has dealt with labor, it has mostly been a whiggish and descriptive-fragmentary history. Labor history, including "critical" approaches, has primarily focused on the celebrities and events within trade-union institutions. I suggest that only the guidance of conceptual and theoretical framework, such as theories of the labor process, leads to a proper picture of the life and work experience of newsworkers. A new labor history should also be a total history, incorporating the diverse dimensions of class and culture.

FROM JOURNALISM HISTORY TO LABOR HISTORY

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to map out the broad theoretical framework within which the factual descriptions of newswork[1] are to be located. If we understand labor history simply as a chronicle of various aspects concerning labor across time, which aspects are to be included and which ones excluded? How are we going to interpret the facts? How can we conceptualize the notion of history itself? Although this paper does not inherit the Marxist theory of the labor process as it appears in the current literature, it accepts at least the basic assumptions of Marxist theory, i.e. the notions of critique and totality.

First, a labor history of the newspaper needs to critically evaluate the way factual materials are organized, or the way historical narratives are written. Traditional literature on labor has been written from an entrepreneurial perspective. The history of technology has been the story of managerial problems for the newspaper business. I will attempt to conceptualize labor history from a "bottom-up" perspective, which interprets organizational and technological changes in terms of their impact on the skill, job-control and culture of anonymous newsworkers.

---

[1]. The term, newsworkers, is used here to refer to workers connected, directly or indirectly, to newspaper production. This generic term does not only refer to professional segments, i.e. reporters, but also includes the blue-collar segments, such as typographers. This inclusion has a historical reason that the division of labor varies and could be re-defined period to period, just as in the 19th century the printing function used to be a central skill for a journalist's career, sometimes including an editorial function.

Second, labor history should be a total history, which subsumes the cultural, economic and political aspects of labor. A critical approach has often focused on the most dramatic element, such as trade-unionism movement or dramatic organizational changes (Nielson, 1983; Wasko, 1983). But the critical approach left largely unexplained the journalistic culture. Although the romance of journalism may have waned, the bohemian and individualist nature of journalistic work of the past left considerable cultural residue on the economics and politics of trade unionism of newsworkers. Without explaining the "cultural" aspect of newswork, any attempt to critically analyze the material conditions of newsworkers is doomed to fail. If a "critical" history of newswork is to be feasible, it should be a total history as well.

In this paper, I will examine the problems of traditional journalism history and glean fragmentary insights from the literature. I will also reflect on how theoretical approaches, such as Harry Braverman's theory of the labor process, illuminate research on the labor history of the newspaper.

The Poverty of Journalism History

Journalism historians and organizational researchers have paid attention to labor, organization and technology, which represent important elements of the newspaper as a business institution. Those studies, although mostly obscure theoretically, supply informative descriptions of the various aspects of the labor process. The problem lies in the way the phenomena are analyzed. I will examine the theoretical assumptions of the literature on journalism history and synthesize the insights for a broader theoretical framework.

A Whiggish History

The way journalism historians handle the subject matter has been rather descriptive and directed at "fact-finding." Traditional journalism history has segregated itself from the historiographical mainstreams of social, cultural and economic history (Carey, 1974; Jowett, 1975; McKerns, 1977; Stevens and Garcia, 1980). Many critiques of journalism history, however, observe that the descriptive history has been dominated by one implicit paradigm of interpretation, namely what Carey (1974, pp. 3-4) calls following Herbert Butterfield, "a whig interpretation of journalism history."

A whiggish perspective regards journalism history "as the slow, steady expansion of freedom and knowledge." Carey notes that the paradigm is implicit but is deeply "absorbed in the invisible culture of graduate school" (p. 3). A whiggish history suggests that history is a constant progress from the past up to the present. A modern newspaper becomes a standard, whereby all journalism practices in the past are evaluated. The task of a journalism historian is to chronicle the progress of the ideas and philosophies of the great publishers and editors. Ever since Frederic Hudson (1872) first formulated journalism history as a story of great men and great anecdotes, the old-fashioned journalism history has been preoccupied with biographies of publishers and editors.

What are the problems of a whig interpretation of journalism history concerning the study of labor and technology? An outspokenly whig interpretation of the history of labor or technology may be difficult to find. But it still is important to examine the implicit implications, because the whiggish assumption has so long permeated journalism history. First, insofar as history appears as a story of progress of values and ideas, the business and labor side of journalism gets marginal attention as theoretical problems. As Robert Sobel (1976, p. 5) notes, "the biographies of leading publishers tend to emphasize their career as molders of public opinion, not so much as capitalists and entrepreneurs." The entrepreneurial perspective obscures how the business nature of the newspaper organization affects the work experience of newsworkers as well as their molding of "public-opinion."

The problem of the whiggish paradigm lies not only in the narrow-sightedness, but also in the confusing nature of the paradigm. In recent decades, it has been difficult to find a whiggish paradigm in its naive, pure form. Journalism histories moved from an exclusive emphasis on biography to the business aspects of journalism. Most literature includes a more complex picture of the newspaper as a business as well as an opinion molder. For instance, Alfred McClung Lee's The Daily Newspaper in America (1937) introduced what he claimed to be a "sociological" aspect to old-fashioned journalism biographies. Journalism history has also been diversified in terms of research topics. There is already a group of literature which concentrates on the business side of journalism (for a comprehensive review, see Smith and Dyer, 1989). As a result of the multiplication, the theoretical, as well as moral, implications of the historical narratives become gradually ambiguous.

Why do we need a critique of a whiggish history, which is a vanishing breed? Although journalism history broadens beyond the story of ideas and ethics to include the business aspect, it still has much in common with the old-fashioned whiggish approach.

Business History

When Allan Nevins urged research into a "history of newspapers as business institutions" as a branch of journalism history, he might have already anticipated a burgeoning business history of the newspaper (Nevins, 1959, p. 421). Because most of the literature on labor and technology belongs to or relates to business history, it is necessary to clarify the meaning of business history and its problems. Business history in the broadest sense encompasses "all the activities of businessmen in the past." More specifically, business history concentrates "on businessmen as decision makers and as builders or destroyers of institutions, as well as on the ideas and accumulated knowledge affecting the place, timing, and conduct of business activities" (Hidy, 1968, p. 474). What underlies business history is the conviction that human decisions have "significantly shaped the stream of economic and social change." It also emphasizes "the process of change and the generation of change," but the change is "always initiated by man" (p. 474).

While a whiggish approach presents ideas and values as the determining forces of journalism history, a business history seems managerial aspects as central. Nevertheless, the business history of the newspaper inherits much of the underlying assumptions of a whiggish interpretation of journalism history. In a business history, the history of the newspaper does not appear solely as a story of progress of ideas and anecdotes of great editors and publishers. A business history of the newspaper is concerned with how the dollar-and-cents aspects, as well as the ideas and values of businessmen, have shaped the news. The whiggish assumption of progress is less conspicuous and moral implications of research become less clear. But the "business" history inherits from a whiggish history the emphasis on progress and the tremendous initiatives of publishers (now as businessmen rather than as public-opinion molders). In a popular journalism-textbook by Michael Emery and Edwin Emery (1988), one may find a perfect example, which synthesizes the history of editors and publishers as public-opinion molders and the history of the same people as businessmen.

The most conspicuous characteristic of business history is that the historical narrative is written from a "top-down" perspective of management. This view considers labor in terms of being a factor of production and--not surprisingly--the changes in the work experience of newsworkers become rather obscure or entirely ignored. But writing a labor history of the newspaper means more than devoting space to the ignored aspects of labor. It is also necessary to shift the point of view of the historical narrative. Particularly, since the business history of the newspaper has already acknowledged labor without shifting its perspective. Consequently, the narrative is rather confusing, including detailed facts which do not neatly fit its purpose.

There is another characteristic of business history. i.e. the "amorphous nature" of the field (Hidy, 1968, p. 475). Recent decades have seen the proliferation and fragmentation of research into some aspects of journalism business. But the analyses of business and technological changes have often been cut off from their broad social, cultural context. An all-inclusive synthesis of those fragmentary research into a broader picture of a business history of the newspaper has been difficult to find2. There also have been few attempts to conceptualize and to theorize on the history of the newspaper business. Nevertheless, the fragmentary research provides a basic stepping stone for well-grounded theorizing. I will summarize below the literature that seems relevant to this dissertation3.

---

[2]. Simon N.D. North's special report for the U.S. Census (North, 1884) and Alfred McClung Lee's The Daily Newspaper in America (1937) are still the most comprehensive work on the business history of the newspaper.

[3]. For bibliographical information, I have greatly benefitted from Smith and Dyer (1989).

The changing division of labor among newspaper employees is one of the most basic subjects for understanding the work experience of newsworkers. But there are no comprehensive studies of the division of labor within newspapers; neither do we see any comprehensive research on reporters and newsgathering. The only exception, although rather descriptive, is the study by Ted Curtis Smythe (1980) on the working conditions of reporters around the turn of the century. The studies on news sources4 offer fragmentary clues to studies of the organization and division of tasks among news staffs in the past.

Compared to newsroom employees, one finds even less systematic work on the employees in the production and distribution5 sectors. Most studies are descriptive documentation of the trade-union institutions (Barnett, 1909; Executive Council, 1964; Lynch, 1925; National Labor Relations Board, 1938; Stevens, 1912; Stewart, 1907; Tracy, 1913). Elizabeth Faulkner Baker (1957) documents the history of another sector of print-shop employees, i.e., The

---

[4]. Much literature provides fragments of information on the "news-making" process and the "sources of news: such as "local news" (Russo, 1980), "foreign news" in the 1840s (Schwarzlose, 1983), newsgathering by mail from exchanges and correspondents (Kielbowicz, 1982, 1987). Donald Lewis Shaw (1981) traces the trends in the composition of news sources for dailies and nondailies from 1820 to 1860, and describes the division of tasks among staffs in writing news.

[5]. On the subject of the employees of the newspaper-distribution sector, David E. Whisnant (1972) has written one of the rare studies of the newsboy.

International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union. In the process of tracing the course of policies and activities of unions, she discusses two closely related issues: "effects of technology upon printing and printing trades unionism, and the changing role of foremen and of union-management relations" (P. xiv). The area of the blue-collar sector of newspapers, however, remains a largely unexplored territory.

Technology is another subject which could provide useful information on the history of labor and the labor process, but there has been no comprehensive history of newspaper technology. A few studies, however, examine the influence of the new technology, such as the telegraph (Carey, 1969, 1983; Smith, 1978; Birkhead, 1982, pp. 171-80), Video Display Terminals (Solomon, 1985a, 1985b) or Videotexts (Weaver, 1983). No attempts of a systematic study have been made on the implications of other technologies, such as the typewriter, telephone, teletype, the camera, and the wirephoto machine. Alfred McClung Lee (1937) only briefly examines the impact of the typewriter and telephone as part of a larger study. The innovations of printing technology, such as offset printing, photocomposition and computer type setting, remain a largely unwritten chapter of the business history of the newspaper.

Although this literature summarizes useful information on the impact of technology on journalism practices, most of the literature lacks theoretical implications. Occasionally, one may find the conceptual influence of a whig interpretation,i.e., the idea of history as a story of progress. For example, Emery and Emery (1988, p. 214) write, newswork becomes "sophisticated with the use of the telephone, the typewriter, and a rewrite staff." The description of technical aspects mostly takes place in isolation from broader theoretical questions, for instance, skill-composition of labor, labor-market structures, the shifting division of labor, or the political culture of trade unionism[6].

The most fundamental problem of the business history of the newspaper comes from the fact that most literature lacks a conceptual and theoretical framework. The studies of "newsgathering," "print shops," or technology, as with journalism history in general, have divorced themselves from the major current of contemporary historiography. What is necessary for labor history is a theoretical interpretation of the factual descriptions of various aspects of newswork.

---

[6]. Carey's cultural approach is rather uniquely exceptional, and will be discussed later.

Traditional Labor History

A top-down perspective of business history has failed to properly conceptualize labor as one of the central forces, influencing the specific historical form of journalism practices. Although a traditional labor history of the newspaper brought labor into focus, it had theoretical limitations and failed to provide a complex picture of the work experience of newsworkers.

Within traditional journalism history, there have been works dealing with the history of labor. But, strictly speaking, they belong to the history of trade-union institutions. For example, there are works on the white-collar union of editorial employees, The American Newspaper Guild (Leab, 1970; Kuczun, 1970), as well as works on the union of blue-collar employees, i.e. The International Typographical Union (National Labor Relations Board, 1938; Stevens, 1913). The works on the ITU are mostly chronological compilations. Daniel Leab (1970) takes a relatively broader perspective and describes the circumstances which forced newsroom employees, who were mostly reluctant to unionize, to form trade unions.

Nevertheless, since the ruling idea of labor history is a history of trade-union institutions, writers basically follow the tradition of the "old" labor history, which was established by John Commons and the Wisconsin School of labor history. The old labor history deals with the familiar subjects, such as leaders, organizations, strikes and politics of unions. The problem,according to, according to Eric Hobsbawm (1974, p. 372), is that old labor history tends to identify labor history with labor-movement history, and neglects the history of the working classes themselves. This neglect leads to an isolation of the labor-movement history from the rest of history.

Although some critical researchers have challenged mainstream media historians (Mosco and Wasko, 1983), their "critical" approaches to labor history share the problems of traditional labor history. Vincent Mosco and Janet Wasko (1983) offer a compilation of articles revealing the current state of research concerning the labor-side of communication. Their anthology contains works on trade unions in film and broadcasting industries, but does not include the newspaper industry (Nielson, 1983; Wasko, 1983). Nevertheless, I will examine the theoretical assumptions of these two labor historians, because their analysis can also be applied to the newspaper industry.

Two observations can be made about this historical research. First, the main emphasis is still on trade-union institutions, and not on workers themselyes. Michael Nielson emphasizes a "bottom-up" perspective which sees film as the product of human labor, and suggests a look at "what

[the] relation of production does to men's and women's lives" (p. 82). But his analysis remains "satisfied with unraveling exploitation and capital accumulation," and focuses on conflicts between management and trade-unions. Besides a sympathetic attitude toward unions and labor, however, however, one does not find much theoretical evidence to make his work into a "bottom-up" perspective. In other words, despite the radical political orientation, those critical labor histories inherit the problematics of traditional labor history with its emphasis on celebrities and institutions. A historical narrative written from the "bottom-up" looks at workers themselves, i.e. what happened to the life and work experience of workers. Only the guidance of a theoretical and conceptual framework makes such a venture possible.

The second problem of their critical approach is the obsession with being "critical." They tend to excessively emphasize the contradictory nature of commodity production and the resistance from the labor side and ignore the co-optive aspect of organizations, i.e. the reproduction of labor power. Instead of investigating the broad interlinks between different segments of labor or between culture and organization, they focus on a marginal or peripheral sector (both writers examine technical workers, without relating them to white-collar workers). It is partly because the professional segment does not neatly fit Nielson's or Wasko's framework of class struggle. As a result, both writers preserve the radical perspective, but lose the breadth of a critical analysis. While we are told that the commodity-production system intensifies contradictions, we do not see why the production system intensifies exploitation of technical workers on the one hand and co-opts professional workers on the other hand. Without taking into account the central segment of professionals, a critical history of the newspaper is rarely feasible. A "critical" history needs to incorporate an analysis of the linkage between segments of labor, and between the organization and society.

For a New Labor History

In a critique of journalism history, Hanno Hardt (1989) underscores the necessity for a labor history of the media industry, which critically analyzes the history of newsworkers within a broad social and political context. Hardt seems to suggest what amounts to a "new labor history" in the mainstream historiography, which is long-overdue in journalism history (see Faler, 1969; Krueger, 1971). A new labor history of the newspaper needs to explore new directions and theoretical issues, which have been absent in traditional journalism history.

The Necessity of Theory

First of all, a new labor history of the newspaper needs to explore theoretical approaches. It is necessary to go beyond a chronicle of events and connect changes in the workplace to theoretical issues, e.g. the skill-composition of labor, labor-market structures, the shifting division of labor, or the political culture of trade unionism. Because historical archives do not reveal direct answers to these questions, journalism historians must move beyond the documents. Only through the guidance of a conceptual framework, may one plow through documents and lead to a proper picture of the history of labor.

It is presumably because concepts may underscore the importance of certain aspects, which often become inconspicuous in historical documents. For example, it is difficult to conceptualize what happened to the skill and work experience of workers, from the top-down perspective of traditional journalism history, with its emphasis on institutions and celebrities. The emphasis on events and changes tends to ignore inconspicuous changes in he workplace, e.g. the culture and work experience of ordinary workers. A theoretical perspective of labor history may probably chronicle those "quiet" changes in labor history. For instance, Harry Braverman's labor-process theory represents such an example of a theoretical approach to labor history (Braverman, 1974). Theories of the labor process raised and inspired significant theoretical issues in labor history and seem applicable to journalism history. Braverman's theoretical contribution lies in providing theoretical stimulation rather than theoretical perfection.

The notion of the labor process comes from Karl Marx, who, in Capital volume 1, presented a conceptual scheme for a general analysis of the capitalist production. The labor process is, on the one hand, a technical process, i.e. "the metabolic interaction between man and nature, the everlasting nature-imposed condition of human existence" and is common to all forms of society (Marx, 1977, p. 290). The labor process, on the other hand, is a social process, which in capitalist societies appears as a process of producing surplus value.

Braverman popularized the concept of the labor process, and opened up a labor-process approach to labor history[7]. Braverman examined the traditional literature on organizations, labor, and technology and provided an alternative reading of labor history. Traditional business history tends to consider organizational and technological changes as progress, because the literature takes into consideration the changes primarily in terms of technical efficiency. The labor process consequently appears as the relations between workers and machines/organizations. Braverman criticizes the ideologically mystifying nature of the managerial perspective and emphasizes that the labor process innately involves social relations, the relations between capital and labor. Out of the chronicles of organizational and technological changes, Braverman reconstructs a critical history of management ideologies and strategies of control. Braverman examines changes in the labor process and relates his analysis to broad themes such as the impact of technology on skills, management strategies of control, and the impact of the labor process on class structure and the rest of society.

---

[7]. Paul Thompson (1983) provides a comprehensive review of theoretical debates, critiques and empirical research, which Braverman's Labor and Monopoly Capital inspired.

Braverman argues that industrialization gradually destroyed craft as a unity of mental and manual labor and produced a large group of deskilled workers industry-wide. Industrial innovations enabled management to tighten control over the labor process, while workers gradually lost skills and the scope of discretion in daily job executions. He suggests that throughout different segments of industry (office work as well as manual labor), the homogenization and degradation of labor represent broad historical tendencies in the capitalist labor process. Braverman attempts to show that the overall deskilling of labor and the direct managerial control over the labor process represent two interrelated aspects of the historical process. Braverman's problematic thesis of degradation of labor intrigued debates as to the issues of control, skill, and deskilling.

Control

The first issue relates to the notion of control. Because the labor process in its nature involves social relations between labor and capital, control becomes the most crucial issue in the labor process approach. Braverman (1974, p. 90) emphasizes that a perfect system of control is an "absolute necessity for adequate management." He finds the most appropriate solution to capitalist goal of control in the scientific management of Frederick Taylor[8]. Braverman suggests that not only manual labor but also mental labor, such as office work, have been amenable to the principles of scientific management.

The problem is whether direct control has been the only way of control available to management. Critiques denounce the view that direct control is the only imperative of capital and elaborate the diverse typologies of modes of

---

[8] Braverman (1974, p. 119; emphasis original) summarizes the three principles of Taylorism: "if the first principle is the gathering and development of knowledge of labor processes, and the second is the concentration of this knowledge as the exclusive province of management--together with its essential converse, the absence of such knowledge among newsworkers--then the third is the use of this monopoly over knowledge to control each step of the labor process and its mode of execution."

control: for instance, "direct control" and "responsible autonomy" (Friedman, 1977), "simple," "technical," and "bureaucratic" controls (Edwards, 1979). The conceptual typology of control may be applied to empirical examination of the labor history of the newspaper. Which segments of newsworkers have been amenable to direct managerial control? What are the counter-balancing forces, which keep management from employing direct control on a larger scale? What kind of means did management use to control newsworkers? How have the modes of control shifted? These are research questions that may be pursued within a labor-process approach to journalism history.

Another question may be raised as to whether control of labor represents an absolute imperative for management. Braverman seems to suggest that control represents the most crucial goal of management. But is it the case that control guarantees management the most effective means of profit-making? By the end of the nineteenth century, because of technological backwardness of printing machines and the powerful unions of printing craftspeople, mechanical "production," i.e. printing, was a major problem for newspaper management. The notion of direct control over the labor process in Braverman's sense might be illuminating to understand the managerial fascination with innovations in printing technology in the nineteenth century. However, in the late twentieth century, direct control considerably loses its significance. Benson Soffer (1960, p. 145) suggests that, in firms like contemporary newspapers, where profit comes largely from a sales effort, production management and labor control are only of secondary significance. Therefore, it is inevitable to steer one's attention not only to the site of production but also to the whole segments of business environments, e.g. production, distribution, and consumption. Although Braverman's notion of control has many problematic aspects, he has inspired in the labor-process approaches more elaborated theories of control, which contribute to a more sophisticated understanding of capital-labor relations in the labor process.

Skill

Another theoretical issue in the labor process approach is concerned with the notion of skill. There are a few crucial issues as to Braverman's deskilling thesis. The first issue is whether deskilling can be affirmed empirically as a historical trend. While Braverman suggests that general deskilling is a long-term historical trend of the capitalist labor process, empirical studies show that the actual process involves heterogeneous process of deskilling and reskilling. Even though, as Braverman suggests, the long-term tendency is the degradation of working class in general, the specific working class consists of heterogeneous segments, with various degrees of deskilling. The issue of deskilling becomes primarily an empirical question. To what extent is deskilling an empirical trend in the history of newswork? Which sectors have been deskilled and which ones have been exempt from the deskilling process? What is the impact of the heterogeneous process of deskilling on the newsworkers as a group? These are some of the hypothetical questions for a specific historical study of newswork.

However, because Braverman's critical analysis of the deskilling process presupposes a notion of skill as a normative criterion, the implications are broader than empirical hypothesis-testing. What are the implications of Braverman's notion of skill that emphasizes autonomy and unity of conception and execution? In journalism history, the shift from the age of printer-journalists to the era of objective reporting has been perceived as progress or professionalization of newswork. However, even to those, who do not accept a labor-process approach, it is not clear whether the "professionalization" of journalists have entailed broadening autonomy and discretion. While the establishment of job skills and values may not be denied, the evaluation of the "progress" is not unproblematic. Braverman's notion of skill makes possible a re-evaluation of the mythic notion of up-grading of newsworkers. Braverman assumes craft as a prototype of skill and even tends to idealize it. Is it possible, from a craft perspective, to idealize the printing craft of journalism as an autonomous mode of newswork? What are the implications and problems of such a perspective? The craft perspective may not be refuted simply as nonsense, because what Braverman emphasizes is not the concrete craft itself but the autonomy and unity of conception and execution which the skill of craft entails. The complexity in interpretations of skill attests to the promising nature of these theoretical questions.

From the Labor Process to Totality

Braverman further locates the transformation of the production sphere "within a much more comprehensive theory of all the social relations of the new capitalist totality" (Thompson, 1983, pp. 85-6). In a brief section titled "The Universal Market," Braverman attempts to show schematically how the changes in the labor process deeply affect the whole life pattern of the working class. Braverman (1974, p. 271) writes:

> It is only in the era of monopoly that the capitalist mode of production takes over the totality of individual, family, and social needs and, in subordinating them to the market, also reshapes them to serve the needs of capital. It is impossible to understand the new occupational structure--and hence the modern working class--without understanding this

> development. How capitalism transformed all of society into a gigantic marketplace is a process that has been little investigated, although it is one of the keys to all recent social history.

However, Braverman fails to describe the empirical detail so as to take into account the specific forces and causes influencing the transformation of the universal market. Braverman tends to induce the total picture of the whole society logically from his analysis of the capitalist labor process, rather than from a specific analysis. As Michael Burawoy (1978, p. 295) criticizes, Braverman constructs capitalist totality "out of the commodification of social life and with it the degradation of work as manifested through the separation of conception and execution." The fundamental cause of the transformation of social life is always "the defining principle of capitalist society, its essence, its true self, an irresistible force" (p. 296). Braverman's problem also lies in his simplistic notion of totality, which reduces complexity to the logic of the capitalist labor process.

The total analysis of the changing work experience and life pattern of workers is a challenging but worthy project. Braverman initiated such a venture in a very schematic way. His attempt is suggestive to journalism historians, because many studies of newspaper organizations have failed to go beyond the boundaries of organizations. If the labor process is the production process of a commodity called news, the mode of the labor process may be affected not only by managerial strategies but also by the consumption patterns of buyers. Or, conversely, how did the rise of objective reporting affect the consciousness of readers in general as well as journalists themselves? These are some of the many questions which may be pursued.

Class

Class becomes a central issue of labor history, in that labor history deals with relationships between different groups which have a hierarchy of interests and power. Labor history has often been the subject of the Left, partly because of its highly political implications (Hobsbawm, 1974). Even though a Marxist notion of antagonistic class relations is not accepted, a sort of "class relations," whatever the nature of class, needs to be explained. But the notion of labor, not to mention class, may be repulsive to many journalists and journalist-oriented scholars in the United States. Journalism historians have shown a bias against Marxist concepts. There has never been a thoroughgoing Marxist interpretation of journalism history nor a radical labor history. The bias itself may indicate the complicated and problematic nature of applying the notion of class to newsworkers. To make a convincing argument, one needs to show a complex picture of occupational structure, work habits, and the culture of work among newspaper employees. Just as the notion of class may not be refuted on the basis of the romanticism of journalism, class may not be constructed out of the fantasy of radical intellectuals.

The implications for the labor history of the newspaper are double-sided. First, a labor history of the newspaper needs to show a complex picture of occupational structure and class structure and detailed analyses of the changes in the labor process. In journalism history, there has never been a study which examines how changes in the workplace (either newswork or print shop) of the newspaper have affected the class-position of newsworkers within the hierarchy of class structure. The study which investigates the connections between the workplace and class may illuminate studies on "professionalism" in journalism. For example, a question may be raised as to how the "class position" of newsworkers influences the political orientation of journalism practices.

Studies of newswork may benefit from Braverman's broad perspective, which connects changes in occupational structure to the making and transformation of class. Braverman's approach to class, however, is too problematic to be applicable to newswork. The problem with Braverman's notion of class lies in the "objective" approach to class. Braverman admits the "self-imposed limitation to the 'objective' content of class and the omission of the 'subjective' will" (Braverman, 1974, p. 27). But the problem is not merely the omission of one of the important factors. The subjective formation of class and work experience are as much a crucial part of the formation of class and therefore may not be separated conceptually. Braverman implicitly separated "class in itself" (class determined from "objective" relations of production) and "class for itself" (class self-conscious of its objective position) and implies that the latter flows from the former.

What annoys labor historians to a great extent is that the subjective understanding of newsworkers would not accept the working-class position, determined in terms of working conditions. One may find the typical example in the early days of The American Newspaper Guild (see, Leab, 1977). Most newsroom employees of the early twentieth century were under extremely poor working conditions and unstable job security. Nevertheless, the "bohemian" culture among newsworkers and their reluctance to trade-unionism militated against the attempts to improve working conditions. What kept newsroom employees from subjectively forming working-class consciousness, even when their "objective" positions were inferior to their counterpart of blue-collar workers in print shops? Without a thorough understanding of the culture of a newsroom, any attempt to locate the formation of newsworkers as a class will fail. In sum, a labor historian of the newspaper needs to describe a complex picture of the occupational structure and culture of newsworkers.

Culture

Another direction which a new labor history of the newspaper needs to pursue is a cultural studies approach to the work experience of newsworkers. While economic theories are useful tools of analysis, as E.P. Thompson (1966, p. 192) warns, "we should not assume any automatic, or over-direct, correspondence between the dynamics of economic growth and the dynamics of social or cultural life." Despite its problems--which will be discussed later--, Carey's notion of cultural history may still offer useful insights into the study of labor history (Carey, 1974). Cultural history in Carey's definition is "the study of consciousness in the past." Following the anthropologist Clifford Geertz, Carey urges journalism historians to explore "meaning" or "the pattern of significance" of the people in the past. Carey (1974, p. 5) writes:

> When we grasp the history of journalism, we grasp one form of human imagination, one form--shared by writer and reader--in which reality has entered consciousness in an aesthetically satisfying way. When we study changes in journalism over time, we are grasping a significant portion of the changes that have taken place in modern consciousness since the Enlightenment.

What Carey suggests is a history of what people thought, felt and believed. His study of the telegraph (Carey, 1983) is a specific example of what a cultural approach looks like.

Why is it that, 26 years after Carey proposed a cultural history, one rarely finds a culturalist interpretation of newspaper institutions, and to what extent is it the result of the limitation of Carey's concept itself?

For example, Carey (1974) emphasized the necessity of a cultural history of reporting, which arguably represents the most crucial chapter of a labor history of the newspaper. Such a cultural history of reporting is based on a notion of reality as symbolic exchange. But at the same time, as David Paul Nord (1988) notes in his critique of Carey, one must not ignore power and institutional control. The Geertzian model, which Carey follows, has ignored power, and Ronald Walters' critique of Geertz can also be directed at Carey (Walters, 1980, p. 553):

> Ideally, thick description says something about society. In practice, it often describes reality as a drama in which the focus is upon symbolic exchanges, not social consequences. Words like "class," "exploitation," and--most important--"power," recede, drop out of the analysis, or take on new, less strident meaning.

David Paul Nord (1988, p. 18) refutes Carey's cultural approach as "the seductive but futile search in the press for the 'consciousness' of the people." Instead, he recommends a return to the traditional focus on "powerful individuals and institutions." But, contrary to Nord's argument, the centrality of economic and political power may not be lost in the search for the consciousness of the people. The problem with Carey's approach does not mean that the implications of Carey's cultural approach are exhausted.

Although his main concern is symbolic exchange, Carey (1974, p. 5) admits the importance of the aspects of class, exploitation and power:

> Journalism is not only literary art; it is industrial art. Stylistic devices such as, for example, the inverted pyramid, the 5W lead, and associated techniques are as much a product of industrialization as tin cans. The methods, procedures and canons of journalism were developed not only to satisfy the demands of the profession but to meet the needs of industry to turn out a mass produced commodity. These canons are enshrined in the profession as rules of news selection, judgment, and writing.

What Carey lacks is an analysis of how the nature of commodity influences the structure of meaning. Carey never incorporates his insights into conceptual or specific analyses. These problems are conspicuous in his analysis of the telegraph, where he (1983, p. 305) emphasizes that the telegraph "opened up new ways of thinking about communication within both the formal practice of theory and the practical consciousness of everyday life." But Carey suggests that the impact comes from the nature of technology rather than from the social process by which technology is put into use. The social process may not be directly translated from the nature of technology itself.

The crucial and remaining task for labor historians of the newspaper is to incorporate Carey's insights into analyses of economic and political power of media institutions. Class, status and power, as well as culture, become central issues in the study of newswork. In The Making of the English Working Class, a British historian, E.P. Thompson (1966), provided a pioneering example of labor history, which successfully synthesizes the focus on experiences and consciousness with analyses of class and social structure. In the United States, Herbert Gutman (1977) introduced a new labor history as an alternative to the old labor history of the Wisconsin school. In his essay, "Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America, 1815-1919," he explored the subjects of "changing work habits and the culture of work" (p. 9).

For example, Gutman notes, "despite the profound economic changes that followed the American Civil War, Gilded Age artisans did not easily shed stubborn and time-honored work habits" (p. 36). To the capitalists, struggling to cut labor costs and improve efficiency, much of the work habits and subcultures[9] of workers proved the laziness and obstinacy of craftsmen as well as the tyranny of craft unions that upheld venerable traditions. To the skilled workers, the work habits symbolized a way of work and life filled with almost ritualistic meanings. Consequently, conflicts over life- and work-styles occurred frequently and often involved the issue of control over the labor process. It is also natural that many artisans "felt new machinery 'hard and insensate,' not a blessing but an evil that took a great deal of joy out of life' because machine-made barrels undercut a subculture of work and leisure" (Gutman, 1977, p. 37). Although not much is known about the pre-modern artisanal subcultures of printers and newsworkers, there also must have been subcultures among those craftsmen.

---

[9]. For example, hand coopers (and potters and cigarmakers,among others) continued to keep the traditions of "Goose Eggs:" and "Blue Mondays." Early on Saturday mornings, coopers brought in a Goose Egg, meaning a half-

Two observations necessitate journalism labor historians, who investigate the changes in labor around the turn of the century, to take into account the artisanal subcultures. First, the preindustrial work habits, the life-styles and subcultures persisted long into the industrializing decades. Gutman (1977, p. 40) writes,

---

barrel of beer, and had a merry time all around. Because usually the good time continued over into Sunday, on Mondays a cooper was not in the bast condition to settle down to the regular day's work. Many coopers used to spend Mondays sharpening up their tools, carrying in stock, discussing current events, and in getting things in shape for the big day of work on the morrow. Thus, "blue Monday" was something of a tradition with the coopers, and the day was also more or less lost as far as production was concerned (Gutman, 1977, pp. 37-8).

"Continuity not consensus counted for much in explaining working-class and especially artisanal behavior in those decades that seen the coming of the factory and the radical transformation of American society." Second, the actual work organizations have been a compromise between the conflicting interests between the preindustrial cultures of workers and new industrialism which the technological innovations brought. Therefore, detailed study of the work habits and subculture of newsworkers, as well as their economic conditions, is essential to understand the changes in the workplace around the turn of the century. But, in the area of journalism history, we have not yet seen research that emulates either Thompson or Gutman.

Conclusion

Journalism historians have failed to give a proper picture of the culture and work experience of newsworkers. In this paper, I attempted to synthesize fragmentary insights in the literature on journalism history and grope for a conceptual framework of new labor history. I do not just suggest that journalism historians have failed to pay enough attention to the subject of labor. Neither do I identify labor history with trade-union history, which tends to isolate labor-movement history from the rest of history. A new labor history shifts the focus of study from the fluctuating events in institutions to the quiet changes in skill, work experience and culture of anonymous workers. The pioneering works by Gutman or Thompson are useful examples for exploring a new labor history of the newspaper.

What is necessary for a sophisticated construction of a working-class history is the incorporation of theoretical approaches from other disciplines and paying more attention to the cultural understanding of newsworkers, which would not accept Marxist discourses. A labor historian needs to construct the complex picture of newsworkers in terms of the "lived experience" of the people in the past, without reducing the subjective description to institutional structure.

The labor-process approach may inspire research on the theoretical issues of organizational changes, which have been absent in the traditional literature on journalism. First, the labor-process approach provides a theoretical ground for an analysis of how technological and organizational changes influence the skill-composition, control structure, and labor market. The labor-process approach further locates an analysis of changes in the labor process within broader social context, such as class structure, and provides a complex picture of changing work experience and life patterns of working class.

Braverman's labor-process approach represents one theoretical option which might be useful for a new labor history. Nevertheless, we should be well aware of the limitations as well as the contributions of a labor-process approach to labor history. Braverman's contribution is considerably marred by his primary emphasis on the objective side of labor history, without paying attention to the consciousness and culture of workers. Braverman's limitation is in a sense the limitation of an economic approach itself. Although the discussion in this paper has been primarily directed at the labor-process approach, other disciplines, such as cultural, anthropological and political theories, may provide useful insights into labor history.

REFERENCES

Baker, Elizabeth Faulkner (1957). Printers and Technology: A History of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, New York: Columbia University Press.

Barnett, George E. (1909). The Printers: A Study in American Trade Unionism, Cambridge: American Economic Association.

Birkhead, Douglas (1982). "Presenting the Press: Journalism and the Professional Project," Unpublished Dissertation, The University of Iowa.

Braverman, Harry (1974). Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Burawoy, Michael (1978). "Toward a Marxist Theory of the Labor Process: Braverman and Beyond," Politics and Society, 8:3&4, pp.247-312.

Carey, James W. (1969). "The Communications Revolution and the Professional Communicator," The Sociological Review Monographs no. 13: The Sociology of Mass-Media Communicators, ed. by Paul Halmos.

Carey, James W. (1974). "The Problem of Journalism History," Journalism History,1:1, pp. 3-5.

Carey, James (1983). "Technology and Ideology: The Case of the Telegraph," In Jack Salzman (eds.), Prospects: The Annual Review of American Cultural Studies, Vol. 8, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, Richard (1979). Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century, New York: Basic.

Emery, Michael and Edwin Emery (1988). The Press and America: An Interpretative History of the Mass Media, 5th ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Executive Council, International Typographical Union (1964). A Study of the History of the International Typographical Union 1852-1963, Vol. 1. Indianapolis: International Typographical Union.

Faler, P. (1969). "Working Class Historiography," Radical America, 3(2), pp. 56-68.

Friedman, Andrew (1977). Industry and Labour: Class Struggle at Work and Monopoly Capitalism, London: Macmillan.

Gutman, Herbert G. (1977). Work, Culture & Society in Industrializing America, New York: Vintage Books.

Hardt, Hanno (1989). "Behind the Public Sphere: Newsworkers, Technology & Media History," Paper presented to Journalism Research Colloquium, University Centre, Dubronik, Yugoslavia.

Hidy, Ralph W. (1968). "History: Business History," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 6, ed. by David L. Sills, New York: Macmillan and Free Press, pp. 474-480.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. (1974). "Labor History and Ideology," Journal of Social History, 7(4).

Hudson, Frederic (1872). Journalism in the United States From 1690 To 1872, New York: Harper.

Jowett, Garth (1975). "Toward a History of Communication," Journalism History, 2.

Kielbowicz, Richard B. (1982). "Newsgathering by Printers' Exchanges Before the Telegraph," Journalism History, 9, pp. 42-48.

Kielbowicz, Richard B. (1987). "News Gathering by Mail in the Age of the Telegraph: Adapting to a New Technology," Technology and Culture, 28, pp. 26-41.

Krueger, T.A. (1971). "American Labor Historiography, Old and New: A Review Essay," Journal of Social History, 4 (Spring), pp. 277-285.

Kuczun, Sam (1970). "History of the American Newspaper Guild," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Leab, Daniel J. (1970). A Union of Individuals: The Formation of the American Newspaper Guild, 1933-1936, New York and London: Columbia University Press.

Lee, Alfred McClung (1937). The Daily Newspaper in America: The Evolution of a Social Instrument, New York: The Macmillan Company.

Lynch, James M. (1925). Epochal History of the International Typographical Union, Indianapolis: International Typographical Union.

Marx, Karl (1977). Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Vol. 1, New York: Vintage Books.

McKerns, Joseph (1977). "The Limits of Progressive Journalism History," Journalism History, 4.

Mosco, Vincent and Janet Wasko ed. (1983). The Critical Communications Review vol.1: Labor, the Working Class, and the Media, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

National Labor Relations Board (1938). Collective Bargaining in the Newspaper Industry, Washington: Government Printing Office.

Nevins, Allan (1959). "American Journalism and Its Historical Treatment," Journalism Quarterly, 36:4, pp. 411-422, 519.

Nielson, Mike (1983). "Towards a Worker's History of the U.S. Film Industry," In Mosco and Wasko eds.

Nord, David Paul (1988). "A Plea for Journalism History," Unpublished paper.

North, Simon Newton Dexter (1884). History and Present Condition of the Newspaper and Periodical Press of the United States: With a Catalogue of the Publications of the Census Year, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Russo, David J. (1980). "The Origins of Local News in the U.S. Country Press, 1840s-1870s," Journalism Monographs, 65.

Schwarzlose, Richard (1983). "The Foreign Connection: Transatlantic Newspapers in the 1840s," Journalism History, 10, pp. 44-49, 67.

Shaw, Donald Lewis (1981). "At the Crossroads: Change and Continuity in American Press News 1820-1860," Journalism History, 8:2, pp. 38-50.

Smith, Anthony (1978). "The Long Road to Objectivity and Back Again: The Kinds of Truth We Get in Journalism," In George Boyce, James Curran and Pauline Wingate (eds.), Newspaper History: From the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day, London: Constable.

Smith, Carol and Carolyn Stewart Dyer (1989). "Taking Stock, Placing Orders: A Historiographic Essay on the Business History of the Newspaper," Paper presented to the History Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Annual Conference, Washington, D.C.

Smythe, Ted Curtis (1980), "The Reporter, 1880-1900: Working Conditions and Their Influence on the News," Journalism History, 7:1-10.

Sobel, Robert (1976). The Manipulators: America in the Media Age, Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Soffer, B. (1960). "A Theory of Trade Union Development: The Role of the 'Autonomous' Workman," Labour History, 1, pp. 141-63.

Solomon William S. (1985a). "Technological Change in the Workplace: The Impact of Video Display Terminals on Newspaper Copy Desk Work," Unpublished Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Solomon William S. (1985b). "From Craftspeople to Production Workers: Video Display Terminals and the Devaluation of Newspaper Copy Editing Work," Communication, 8:2, pp.207-224.

Stevens, George A. (1912). New York Typographical Union No. 6: Study of a Modern Trade Union and Its Predecessors, Albany State Department of Labor.

Stewart, Ethelbert A. (1907). A Documentary of the Early Origins of the International Typographical Union, Indianapolis: International Typographical Union.

Stevens, John D. and Hazel Dicken Garcia (1980). Communication History, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Thompson, E.P. (1966). The Making of the English Working Class, New York: Vintage Books.

Thompson, Paul (1983). The Nature of Work: An Introduction to Debates on the Labor Process, London: The Macmillan Press.

Tracy, George A. (1913). History of the Typographical Union, Indianapolis: Hollenbeck Press.

Walters, Ronald G. (1980). "Signs of Times: Clifford Geertz and Historians," Social Research, 47(3), pp. 537-556.

Wasko, Janet (1983). "Trade Unions and Broadcasting: A Case Study of the National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians," In Mosco and Wasko eds.

Weaver, David H. (1983). Videotext Journalism: Teletext, Viewdata, and the News, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Whisnant, David E. (1972). "Selling the Gospel News, Or: The Strange Career of Jimmy Brown the Newsboy," Journal of Social History, 5, pp. 269-309.

THE PARADOX OF SAMUEL MEDARY

COPPERHEAD NEWSPAPER PUBLISHER

A HISTORICAL STUDY FOR:

THE ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATION
IN JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION

by

REED W. SMITH
Ph.D. CANDIDATE
E.W. SCRIPPS SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM
OHIO UNIVERSITY
ATHENS, OHIO

THE PARADOX OF SAMUEL MEDARY

Following his death in 1864, the Nevada Gazette editorialized, "When Sam Medary died one of the devil's own children went home to his father's house."[1] But in 1932, Ohio State University inducted him into its Journalism Hall of Fame. These two examples point up the quandary of assessing the Civil War editor of The Columbus, Ohio Crisis, Samuel A. Medary. The epitaph was written by a Republican newspaper, which attacked his political activities, while the award focused on his journalistic achievements. This paper will evaluate the appropriateness of both sentiments.

Although much has been written about Medary, questions remain unanswered. What motivated his campaign of ink, in which he questioned President Lincoln's military and political decisions? And did his activities contribute to a clearer understanding and a broadening of the parameters of freedom of the press?

II

Medary operated his newspaper during a difficult period in American journalism history. The Civil War created a situation in which the priorities of winning the conflict and of preserving constitutional civil liberties clashed.

In The Press and America, Edwin and Michael Emery noted "In the years preceding the war the American press had become so prosperous, aggressive and independent . . . it was sensitive to any form of restriction."[2] Many newspapers were partisan; they made no pretense of objectivity. Editors tended to be politicians first and newspapersmen second. An Ohio historian has observed of this era: "The newspaper editor was, in fact, lord and master of a considerable group of loyal disciples."[3] It was a common practice for newspapers, which were aligned with a losing political party, to criticize the winning party's leaders and policies, whether they were proving successful or not.

From the earliest days of the Civil War Northern newspaper reporters traveled with Union troops. Through the use of telegraph lines they were able to transmit bulletins from the front to their editors in a timely manner. However, it was soon discovered that the Confederacy was learning of troop movements and battle plans by intercepting these telegraph messages. At the same time, in the border states of Kentucky and Maryland, Southern sympathizers attempted to convince the people of those states to secede, as Tennessee and Virginia had done. These two situations made a war zone out of more than just those areas where military battles were taking place. To deal with these problems, President Lincoln took unprecedented steps to restrict the flow of information and deal with dissenters.

Recognizing the difficulties a rebellion or invasion could cause in the exercise of effective government, the framers of the Constitution had authorized suspension of the "writ of habeas corpus." Lincoln was the first President to exercise this option. He censored the transmittal of news, by restricting the flow of messages of a military nature over the nation's telegraph lines. In the border states, the President discouraged secession by having outspoken dissenters arrested and held in jail without trial. In Lincoln and the Press, Robert Harper noted these actions caused the Constitution to be strained until "it threatened to crack."[4]

Lincoln's efforts to maintain security set up an untenable relationship between the constitutionally-guaranteed freedoms of speech and the press and the federal government. The highly partisan press not only chose sides concerning Lincoln's drastic policies, but quickly reacted to the perceived threats to its rights to report and editorialize on conduct of the war. This led to a war being fought on two fronts: against the Confederacy and within the Union. The Emerys have observed "One of the serious problems of the war was how to keep the public properly informed without giving aid and comfort to the enemy."[5] The difficulty was exacerbated when numerous Northern newspapers, including Medary's, not only kept the public informed but, in addition, severely criticized Lincoln's policies. In January 1863, Lincoln said he feared "'the fire in the rear'--meaning the Democracy, especially at the Northwest--more than our military chances."[6] According to The Press and America, Lincoln suffered more during the war from editorial abuse than most Presidents.[7]

Opposition newspapers operated throughout the Union, but they were especially prevalent in the Middle Western states of Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and Illinois. They included, the Detroit Free Press, the Chicago Times, the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Dayton Daily Empire, the LaCrosse, Wisconsin Democrat, the

Indianapolis Sentinel and The Crisis.

Many people in the Midwest strongly disagreed with the reasons for fighting a war, and later with the operation of the military effort. Persons who embraced this kind of thinking came to be known as "Copperheads," an analogy to the North American snake, which gives no warning of its attack. Copperhead newspapers reflected this dissenting line of opinion. Later, when the administration took steps to quell this opposition, Copperhead newspapers responded by charging that their freedom of the press was being abridged.

In most Northern cities during the Civil War, there were at least two newspapers which clearly opposed each other along political lines. In Columbus, the Republican Ohio State Journal supported President Lincoln's and Ohio Governor David Tod's pro-war policies. It also carried on a quarrel in print with the Copperhead newspaper in town, Medary's Crisis, which opposed these two men.

III

Ohio historian Eugene Roseboom has said, "Of those whose reputations rest upon their newspaper careers, the name of Samuel Medary undoubtedly should rank near the top."[8] What this statement does not mention is that much of this sizable reputation was earned prior to the Civil War. In the eyes of fellow Copperhead editors, Medary's reputation grew during the war years, but in the eyes of his opponents, between 1861 and 1864 he detracted from his substantial record.

Medary came to Ohio from Pennsylvania as a young man. He initially taught school, but within a short time he became involved in politics, first as a school trustee and then as a county auditor. In 1828, with Thomas Morris [a future U.S. Senator], Medary established a partisan newspaper, The Ohio Sun, in Batavia. The stated purpose of the paper was to perpetuate the legacy of Thomas Jefferson, by helping Andrew Jackson become the next President of the United States.

Medary, a disciple of Jefferson, believed an individual's rights were supreme to those of the government, and they should remain unrestricted. He viewed Jackson as the ideal statesman and the first "People's President." For the rest of his life, Medary aligned himself with the Jacksonian, state's rights point of view. His stated purpose, in publishing The Ohio Sun, was to be "unawed by the influence of the rich, the great, or the noble, the people must be heard and their rights protected."[9]

The editor correctly foresaw that the growth of a centralized national government, which characterized the Civil War era, would diminish state's rights and bring into question civil liberties. Upon his death, The Sun would eulogize that Medary's "greatest anxiety seemed to arise from the fear that he would outlive constitutional law."[10]

In 1834, the newspaperman won election to the Ohio House of Representatives and two years later to the Ohio Senate. From 1837-1847 he held the post of Supervisor of Public Printing for Ohio, a post he attained because his Democratic friends controlled the legislature. In 1837 he became publisher of the Ohio Statesman, the Ohio Democratic organ published at the Capitol. These two positions allowed him to allocate state printing contracts, as well as to control information in the state Democratic newspaper.[11] He published the Statesman for a total of seventeen years, between 1837 and 1857, selling it twice, but each time resuming ownership after a short absence.

By 1856, Medary had risen to the top of the Ohio Democratic party and had gained the title of "The Old Wheelhorse of Ohio Politics." He was a large man, with a full gray beard and a strong command of the English language. He was popular, not only as a politician, but as a speaker and writer. Respected, stubborn and stern, he played the role of the experienced, elder statesman. Fellow Democrats characterized him as "a vigorous partisan. . . . The bitterest of his political foes conceded his ability."[12] Roseboom says Medary seemed at times almost the "dictator of the Democratic party" in the state. The only hitch in his political career occurred in 1854, when a sectional split in the state party cost him a cabinet seat in the Pierce administration.

Medary was instrumental in the national party's nomination of James Buchanan for the presidency in 1856. After his election, Buchanan appointed Medary to the governorships of the Minnesota, and then the Kansas territories. In this latter position, Medary attempted, but failed to defuse the efforts of abolitionist John Brown.

In 1860, the Democratic national convention split because of Southern states' threats to withdraw from the Union and made Republican victory a foregone conclusion. With the subsequent presidential victory by the Republicans, Medary was out of a job and returned to Ohio to launch a campaign to stop the impending crisis.

IV

On the last day of January 1861, at age fifty-nine, Medary began publishing The Crisis, a weekly newspaper that would thrust him into the three most controversial years of his life.[13] He set up business on the corner of Gay and High Streets in Columbus, one block from the state Capitol. The first issue appeared forty-two days after South Carolina seceded from the Union and two months before the first shots were fired on Fort Sumter. In the first edition, Medary asserted that "The Crisis will fully and thoroughly sift the great issues that hang like a cloud of night over our common country."[14] He believed that influential editors could prevent the war, and hoped that "fraternal feeling and discussion"[15] could reunite the Union.

The editor proceeded to say that The Crisis would "work for a 'peaceable solution,' war on Republicanism, and try to save the country from politicians."[16] He felt the common man favored compromise over war, but that the Union was offering no opportunity for such men to be heard; he intended to help them have their say. Medary saw the disintegration of the Union as threatening the very structure of American society and viewed it as his task to re-establish it.

Some critics have speculated that one of the reasons Medary began *The Crisis* was to make money from the conflict, but there is little evidence to support this. *The Crisis* carried limited advertising; its main source of income came from $2.00 yearly subscriptions. Although Medary boasted that the newspaper later attained the largest circulation among the Copperhead press, he never released circulation figures. Biographer Osman Hooper said of Medary's publication of *The Crisis*, "He was not out to make money, but to advocate a cause."[17]

A typical *Crisis* was eight pages long and featured writing by the editor, letters from supporters and stories reprinted from other Copperhead newspapers. Medary employed a skeletal staff and did not utilize a wire service. *Ohio Press in the Civil War* notes that Medary "got out the paper with scissors, a paste pot, and a pen filled with venom."[18] He was not, of course, impartial, but in the words of an earlier evaluator of *The Crisis*, "There is no indication that he ever falsified a report or garbled a public document."[19] It was possible for a reader to tell where the document ended and interpretation began.

Initially, Medary used his paper to argue for peace "at any cost," and he thought this aim necessitated drastic rhetoric. In February 1861, he boldly asserted "the West [including Ohio] would set up for themselves or ally with the South."[20] After the major battles of the war began, he urged that Northern troops be withdrawn from Southern soil. Medary argued the war could not be won and compromise with the South was the only way to preserve

American society. He faulted abolitionists for being the primary cause of the war and labeled their agenda as synonymous with that of the Republican party.

Medary blamed Northern business interests for fostering a belief that the only way to settle the differences between the North and the South was with war. He believed that New England industrialists were attempting to expand their influence though a conspiracy with Northern politicians. The editor charged that the federal government's economic policies "enriched the manufacturer at the expense of western farmers and workingmen."[21]

In March 1861, Lincoln took office and Medary started writing of his disdain for the new President. He considered the Illinois politician a "very ordinary individual,"[22] and asserted that the wrong man was in Washington because Lincoln had been elected by a minority of the voters. After reviewing Lincoln's inaugural address, the editor wrote: "The message gives the president too much elbow room--to steer for any port. I will judge the new president by what he does rather than what he says."[23]

In April 1861, the Ohio Legislature passed a $1 million excise tax to help finance the war. This action, along with Lincoln's efforts to control Union opposition, increased the wrath of the editor of The Crisis. Soon after the start of the war, Lincoln instituted "martial law" in the Northern states. Although it would take two years for Congress to officially confirm Lincoln's authority to take this action, 14,000 arrests were made between 1861 and 1863.[24] Medary saw government attempts to censor speech and the press as intrusions on the Constitution, as well as on state and civil rights. He had harsh words for those members of the press, such as New York's Horace Greeley, who supported administration policies. At one point, Medary said he had "discovered" that the real President of the United States was Greeley, and Lincoln was subservient to him.[25]

Contrary to Lincoln's "house divided" sentiment, Medary believed the nation could survive "half-free and half-slave." As the war dragged on, Medary's writings reflected a man whose sympathies, although initially grounded in politics, later became a personal vendetta against the President.

In many ways, the activities of the Lincoln administration made the Copperhead editor's task easier. The arbitrary arrests, censorship, corruption within the White House, conscription and inept battle performance by Union generals gave men like Medary grist to grind. An 1863 Crisis editorial read: "Lincoln is running our country to perdition . . . everybody not crazy with 'negro on the brain' knows and knows it well."[26] These kinds of statements made it clear where Medary stood on the slavery issue. Press historian Robert Harper said The Crisis was the only newspaper in the North that consistently referred to members of the Negro race as "niggers."

Medary did not think the slavery issue was worth fighting over or could be legally determined by the national government. He reasoned that since the states existed before the federal government, it was up to the individual states to deal with slavery. Furthermore, under the Constitution, the editor charged that the federal government had no jurisdiction in mandating that slaves be granted citizenship. Medary asserted "the negro was never intended to be the equal of the white man."[27]

As with most Copperheads, the underside of Medary's concern with the slavery issue stemmed from his fear that the influx of blacks into the white labor market would reduce white employment opportunities. On March 5, 1862, he wrote, "Now what would be the poor white man's condition in this state with thousands of wooly heads to compete with?" In January 1863, when Lincoln made the Emancipation Proclamation official, Medary called the President "a half-witted usurper" and proclaimed: "The moment is frightful."[28]

Regarding the war, the editor wrote that he opposed it because "in a country based on public opinion it cannot accomplish the end desired. . . . It is entailing a debt and bringing misery on the people disproportionate to the benefits."[29] He made it clear his quarrel was not with those who had been forced to fight--they were patriotic--but he condemned the officers and politicians for theft and fraud in orchestrating the war effort. Nevertheless, his son, Charles, served as an artillery officer in the Union army. In the pages of The Crisis the editor reprinted accounts of the major battles and listed the names of Ohioans killed or missing in action. He referred to Ohio soldiers as "our boys" and praised them for bravery.

By 1862, Medary's assessment was that the first year of the war had been "a year of blood and plunder, of carnage of conflagration . . . of falsehood and corruption . . . of defeat, desolation and death."[30] He charged that Lincoln "ought to be impeached, either for violating the Constitution or for incompetence and idiocy."[31] Throughout the war, he did not veer from his opinion that the administration had not shown good cause for continuance of the costly struggle.

Within the first year of its existence, Medary called The Crisis "one of the most influential voices for those in the Copperhead movement."[32] Historian Henry Hubbart has observed that The Crisis was "the most restless and outspoken newspaper during the Civil War, and increased in circulation at a remarkable rate."[33]

This popularity, coupled with Lincoln's pragmatic dealings with threats to the Union, served as gasoline for Medary's radical fire. An evolution in Medary's approach was reflected in his editorials. As the war moved into its second full year, The Crisis went from its campaign for peace to a campaign to defend constitutional freedoms. Medary's perception was that most of the moves the President made, justified or not, signaled a further erosion in civil rights.

V

The Copperheads also were known as Peace-Democrats. In 1860 they had split with the War-Democrats over the viability of the war settling sectional differences in the United States. During the Civil War, the Governor of Ohio, David Tod, was a War-Democrat, and he was criticized severely by his Peace-Democrat opponents, including Medary.

Although Copperhead activity was prominent throughout the midwestern states, in no state was it more visible or led by more capable men than in Ohio. Among its members were: U.S. Representative and newspaper owner Clement Vallandigham of Dayton; ex-U.S. Senator and Chillicothe Advertiser publisher William Allen; ex-U.S. Senator George Pugh; Dr. Edson Olds of Lancaster; future vice-presidential candidate George Pendleton of Cincinnati; and Medary. Their battle cry was: "The Union as it was, the Constitution as it is."[34]

The Middle-West was fertile ground for this movement for several reasons. Many of the people living in these states were Irish and German immigrants or transplanted Southerners. These farmers, white laborers and former neighbors of slavery, were universally opposed to Abolitionism. They clung to traditional convictions and resisted the elimination of established, sectional boundaries. Many Middlewesterners blamed the economic downturn of 1860-61 on New England business interests. They particularly feared that a stronger, more centralized government would rob them of their independence. Many saw Lincoln's usurpation of constitutional law during the war as a sure sign that the Republicans would eventually elevate Lincoln to the position of "dictator."

In addition, many Democrats had strong pacifist-religious ties. They quarreled with the concept of war as an option for settling differences, and many refused to take up arms. Medary's parents were Quakers, and he was married to a Quaker; but there is little indication that he justified his activities by religious convictions. It is clear, however, that Medary's opinions were consistent with those of many of the people who lived in Ohio during the Civil War.[35]

Initially, Ohio had oversubscribed Lincoln's first call for volunteers in 1861, but in the early days of the war, while the North searched for victory, casualties mounted. Ohio units were especially hard hit, and before the end of the war more Ohio soldiers would be killed than from any other Northern state. The growing casualty lists and incomplete Union victories made fertile ground for protest. Desertions became an increasing problem as the war progressed, and eventually bounties and a draft would be necessary to maintain enlistments. The Copperheads became especially volatile after the enactment of conscription in 1863, which Medary labeled "a monstrous enormity."[36]

Throughout the war, the Copperheads urged Ohio men not to enlist or to desert. They asserted that Union soldiers had a right to reject the cause of those who betrayed white civilization. Eleven Ohioans, including Dr. Olds, served prison sentences for obstructing recruiting efforts. These imprisonments allowed Medary to depict the men as martyrs for free speech. Medary used the pages of his paper to sanction and give voice to the incarcerated resistors. While in prison, they used the pages of The Crisis to correspond with their loyal supporters. The editor again called for Lincoln's impeachment, in December of 1862, because he had directed the arbitrary arrests. Although in reality, Governor Tod had ordered the arrests.[37]

The Copperhead cause gained strength as a result of the 1862 general elections. Much of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and half of Wisconsin went Democratic. Medary called it "the greatest revolution since the election of Jackson."[38] After this, the Copperheads became more aggressive and visible; their campaign reached its pinnacle in the spring of 1863. The war continued to bring mixed results for the Union, and following issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation, the Copperheads sought an accommodation with the Confederacy. But their pleas for peace were as unpopular in the South as they were in the North.

The tide turned against the Copperheads almost as quickly as it had begun. The U.S. Congress had passed The Treason Act in 1862, which closely resembled the peacetime Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. In April 1863, General Ambrose Burnside began a campaign to disable the Copperhead movement. He had been the overly aggressive commander of Union troops during the North's costly defeat at Fredricksburg. Shortly thereafter, Lincoln reassigned him to command the Department of the Ohio, based at Cincinnati, and his jurisdiction included all of the states bordering the Ohio River.

Burnside took it upon himself to aggressively enforce his interpretation of The Treason Act. In April 1863, he issued General Order No. 38, which said, "The habit of declaring sympathy for the enemy will no longer be tolerated. . . . Persons committing such offenses will be subject to military procedures."[39] This meant that such individuals would be denied their rights in civil courts. The General thus set himself up to draw the line between criticism and treason and decide when a speaker or editor gave aid and comfort to the enemy. Medary was outraged, and in the June 1, 1863, edition of The Crisis, he wrote: "We claim the right to discuss public matters . . . and as a conductor of the public press, to give our interpretation of the law."[40]

Vallandigham became Burnside's first target. The former editor and part owner of the Dayton Empire was the most visible Copperhead activist. He boasted that he wished to test the order by making himself a martyr for freedom of speech. Medary had aligned himself with Vallandigham and viewed the Dayton "lighting rod" as a hero. The difference between the two men was that while Vallandigham was politically aggressive and volatile, Medary was a political theoretician, a man of words, not an activist.

In May 1863, Vallandigham was arrested in Dayton by Union troops for challenging the Burnside order. The arrest set up the most celebrated civil liberties case of the war. Medary called Vallandigham's arrest "a great blunder" and warned the Lincoln administration that "civil war might visit the Midwest if rights were trampled upon any more."[41] Vallandigham was tried in Cincinnati, found guilty, and taken to Boston to serve a prison term, but Lincoln, realizing that Burnside had overstepped his authority, had the Copperhead sent to the Confederacy. Eventually, with the assistance of Southern troops, Vallandigham made his way to Canada.

Another 1863 target of Burnside was the Chicago Times and its Copperhead editor Wilbur Storey. Storey had summed up the purpose of his paper's opposition, by saying, "It is a newspaper's duty to print the news and raise hell."[42] In June, Burnside had troops bar the doors to the Times, but under pressure from the Illinois Legislature and his own Cabinet, Lincoln ordered Burnside's order revoked within days.

In the fall of 1863, Medary presided over the Ohio Democratic convention and spearheaded Vallandigham's nomination for Governor. He petitioned Lincoln to return the exile to Ohio, but was denied. Through the pages of The Crisis, however, Vallandigham campaigned for governor, while remaining in Canada. A Crisis editorial read, "Mr. Vallandigham . . . approaches the executive chair of Ohio, with peace and order on his banner."[43] Vallandigham lost the election by over 100,000 votes and Lincoln sent a telegram to the new governor, John Brough, saying: "Glory to God in the highest; Ohio has saved the Union."[44]

VI

Because of Union military and Republican electoral victories, the popularity of the Copperhead movement had diminished by late 1863. The Crisis was denied mail circulation in West Virginia and the newspaper was in financial difficulty.[45] In January 1864, Medary appealed to his subscribers: "We throw ourselves on the generous support of our readers."[46] But other events would soon revitalize The Crisis.

The battle of ideologies between the Copperhead and pro-Lincoln factions had escalated into violence. In 1864, five Ohio Copperhead newspapers were "mobbed" by superpatriotic groups. The Crisis suffered two such occurrences. On March 5, a group of 200 soldiers from Camp Chase, near Columbus, attacked the paper's editorial offices. Fortunately for Medary, the paper was printed at another location and the presses were not destroyed. The editor placed the property loss at $600 to $800 and did not blame the soldiers. He said the soldiers had been influenced by Abolitionist civilians, "too cowardly to own their complicity."[47]

Medary was in Cincinnati at the time, but when he returned the following day, he was accorded a hero's welcome by a crowd of approximately 1,000 supporters. Two weeks later, there was a second attempt to destroy The Crisis. A fire was set, and some damage was sustained, but this attack also failed when police intervened. No specific reason was given for the attacks; the outbursts may have been simply the result of an accumulation of animosities.

Apparently, the attacks helped Medary in attaining the status of a "martyr for freedom of the press." According to press historian Osman Hooper, "These acts of violence served to make The Crisis more popular than ever and gained new friends for its harassed editor."[48] Also, it helped improve the financial situation of the newspaper. Soon afterward, Medary announced that subscriptions were up, and he increased the yearly rate from $2.00 to $3.00.

By 1864, for all intents and purposes, Copperheadism was dead in Ohio. With many of its proponents either in jail, or having moved west, it had lost most of its influence, but The Crisis battled on. In March, Medary continued to write:

> Let us go to work for the campaign of 1864 . . . for state's rights . . . for white men's liberty--for freedom of speech . . . for freedom of the press . . . for peace, unity, good and liberty.[49]

Despite his continued presence, Medary had fallen out of political favor within his own party. His attempts to get a peace plank in the 1864 presidential platform of former-Union General George McClelland were rebuffed by the now more conservative mainline Democrats. Likewise, Medary failed to receive enough votes from his fellow Ohioans to attain a delegate seat to the Democratic convention in Chicago. As a result, he editorialized against the ticket of McClelland and George Pendleton, which he viewed as "too moderate."

An intriguing aspect of Medary's career is that he got away with his brand of social protest for so long. Finally, however, it caught up with him. On May 20, 1864, Medary was indicted by a federal grand jury in Cincinnati for conspiracy, and charged with supporting a subversive group--"The Sons of Liberty." This Copperhead organization was planning to raid the Ohio prison camps at Sandusky Bay and Columbus to free Confederate prisoners, but the attempts never took place and historians have been unable to find evidence that Medary endorsed or knew of the plan.

Rather, this was apparently a fabricated charge to get him arrested for his history of opposition.

Regardless of his involvement, Medary had become a notorious figure. From the soldiers and citizens of Columbus to General Burnside to President Lincoln, he had generated an extensive list of enemies. Republican newspapers wrote that the arrest was overdue, while Copperhead newspapers editorialized in Medary's defense. One supportive editorial called Medary "a brave and indomitable journalist." Another said a charge of conspiracy against Medary was "outrageous and preposterous."[50]

In The Crisis, Medary wrote: "Against all this we have what force an independent press could bring to bear. . . . If a man cannot read a paper in favor of peace . . . what can he read?"[51] Before the strength of the constitutional mandate could be tested in the courts, however, the confrontation was defused.

Medary was soon released on bond and a trial date was set for six months later, in October, 1864. Copperhead Cincinnati Enquirer publisher Washington McLean paid the $3000 bond because he said he wanted to test the strength of freedom of the press. Back in Columbus, Medary wrote of his arrest, "It is too vile a business to spend breath over. It is just the thing . . . to try to injure our paper."[52]

Unfortunately, Medary never got his day in court to fulfill his martyrdom. He collapsed in August, while giving a speech in Columbus, and died November 7, the night before Lincoln's re-election. The cause of death remains unknown, but there was no indication of foul play. Speculation as to the cause included stomach cancer, a heavy cold, severe heart strain or food poisoning. The Cincinnati Enquirer obituary read: "A great and distinguished man . . . whose name had become a household word--has fallen in Ohio."[53]

VII

Historians have had difficulty considering Samuel Medary "the politician" separately from Samuel Medary "the journalist." By the time he died, the editor had attained the status among some of "one of the vilest scoundrels that ever lived."[54] This notoriety has led to judgments about him as a political figure and has clouded the contributions he made to the field of journalism.

Any assessment of Medary is made difficult by his rhetoric. Whereas one aspect of his writing placed him on the high ground, as a "champion for Constitutional freedom," another side of his editorials reflected a man who sunk to "personal animosity." As the war progressed, his politics outweighed his informed judgment. He continued to preach peace, but he worked to incite revolution.

In the political arena, Medary was a victim of his allegiances. Civil War historian Eric Cardinal observed: "He belonged to one of the most misunderstood political parties in American history."[55] On the surface, Medary's desire for peace seemed honorable, but underneath, his sentiments and means for achieving a settlement were misguided, outdated and unclear. In a historical sense, Medary was a Populist. Consistent with this line of nineteenth-century American thinking, he opposed any actions which would diminish individual or state's rights. He was against the termination of slavery and sectionalism on economic grounds. He feared that emancipation would throw whites out of work, and a more unified Union would impose Eastern, industrialized control on the agrarian West.

The most obvious problem for the Copperheads, in achieving credibility, was the fact that they never offered a viable alternative plan for peace. Medary was adept at serving as "a thorn in the side" of the Lincoln administration, but his only alternative to the war was to stop the fighting and let the South continue as a separate entity. This was hardly realistic at the time the editor started proposing it. The lines between the North and South had already been drawn, politically and emotionally.

The Medary episode focuses on several issues concerning the conduct of a war by a democracy versus the right to dissent. The molders of the Constitution made no provision for handling a sectional and intensely partisan press in a period of civil strife. The meaning of the word "press" had changed a great deal since the beginning of the republic.

In the 1860s, dissent was not a new phenomenon in America, but the press had become more influential. During the Revolutionary War, after the dissenters or "Patriots" won, they wrote their own definitions of justice and treason. But by the time of the War of 1812 and the Mexican-American War, dissenters were considered traitors. The Civil War situation was no different. Although Abraham Lincoln took steps which, at the least, bent the spirit of the law, history has treated him with higher regard than it has men like Medary. It would appear that winning the war vindicated the means.

In the final analysis, an unanswered question about this case is: If the editor of The Crisis had lived to be tried, would his case have strengthened freedom of the press, as several Copperhead editors hoped? The answer to that is almost certainly not, but the reality remains that as a result of his activities, Medary had unknowingly already strengthened this freedom.

There is some question whether Medary would have been tried, even if he had lived. The fact that his trial date was set so many months later seems to indicate that there was concern over whether Burnside's latest challenge to the opposition could be enforced. It can certainly be speculated that the previous embarrassments to the Lincoln administration in the Vallandigham and Chicago Times cases had an impact on the lack of speed in dealing with Medary. Indeed, in 1866, the Supreme Court ruled that a military court could not take action against civilians, as had been attempted during the Civil War.[56]

Dating back to the beginning of The Ohio Sun, Medary demonstrated a lifelong commitment to the cause of freedom of the press. The fact that Medary was able to write caustic sentiments in The Crisis for three years, and that he was not arrested on a viable charge, proved that freedom of the press could withstand the pressures of a uniquely difficult circumstance. Medary's experience confirmed this reality, by the fact that all the time he was fighting for freedom of the press, he was effectively protected by it.

It seems clear, therefore, that although Medary's political campaign was unsuccessful, his journalistic campaign, to a greater degree, was successful. It can be argued that the editor of The Crisis, however misguided, helped redefine the outer limits of press dissent in America. Unfortunately, whether the press should remain unrestrained when the safety of the nation is paramount raised questions which remain unanswered.

From another perspective, it also is possible to surmise that Medary made a difference in the Lincoln administration's tactics to quell disloyalty. The questioning of such tactics certainly made the administration consider its aggressive restraint of opposition. This was obvious from a comment by the President at the height of his confrontations with the Copperhead press:

> Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its people, or too weak to maintain its own existence? Must I shoot a simple-minded boy who deserts, while I must not touch a hair of a wiley agitator who induces him to desert?[57]

In this context, historian Richard Hofstadter has said that men like Medary, although often unpopular, serve a worthwhile role in a democracy. Medary played the role of an "agitator," just as, on the other side there was abolitionist Wendell Phillips. In citing Phillips' words, Hofstadter said, "The work of the agitator . . . consists chiefly in talk; he is the counterweight of sloth and indifference."[58] Certainly, Medary attempted to fulfill this role. The problem occurred when, in the eyes of the Lincoln administration, he crossed the line between dissent and treason.

The service the editor provided, however, was not lost on the readers of The Crisis. In a letter to the editor, a female writer thanked Medary because, "Wherever there is wrong in the conduct of public business, you are prompt to point it out . . . it is good to have a watchman on the heights."[59]

This paper has attempted to show why it has been difficult to affix Medary's place in journalism history. It is easy to see why some considered him a champion for freedom of the press, while others cursed his name. Medary believed he was fulfilling his role as a typically aggressive, partisan editor of his era, but the nature of the conflict in question made his agendas appear disloyal.

In the years following the Civil War, politics and the press in America changed dramatically. Nationalism swept the country; the growth of the federal government and decline of regional and local perspectives reduced the influence of state newspaper editors.

In 1937, biographer Helen Dorn reflected about Medary: "One thing is for certain, he died for a principle . . . in the hope that he might prevent destruction of the Union he loved so well."[60] The problem is, he is remembered as dying for the wrong cause, or at least a misguided one.

NOTES

[1] Medary's successor as editor of The Crisis reprinted this quote from the Nevada Gazette, with an editorial defending Medary. The Crisis, January 25, 1865.

[2] Edwin Emery and Michael Emery, The Press and America: an Interpretative History of the Mass Media, 5th edition (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1984), 195.

[3] Helen P. Dorn, "Samuel Medary--Journalist and Politician, 1801-1864," The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly 53 (1944): 15.

[4] Robert S. Harper, Lincoln and the Press (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951), x.

[5] Emery and Emery, 191.

[6] James M. McPherson, The Oxford University History of the United States, Vol. IV: Battle Cry of Freedom, The Civil War Era (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 591.

[7] Emery and Emery, 194.

[8] Eugene H. Roseboom, A History of the State of Ohio, Vol. IV: The Civil War Era, 1850-1873 (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1944), 199.

[9] The Ohio Sun, June 23, 1828, quoted in Dorn, 15.

[10] Osman C. Hooper, "The Crisis and the Man, An Episode in Civil War Journalism," Ohio State University Journalism Series, Vol. I (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1929), 33.

[11] As the Supervisor of Public Printing, Medary had control over state printing contracts, which were typically allocated to local newspaper publishers, often, on the basis of political favoritism.

[12] Hooper, 9.

Crisis, [13] Medary did not comment on why he called his newspaper The relationship to his feelings about the war. He regularly referred to the War Between The States as "the crisis."

[14] Ibid., 199.

[15] The Crisis, March 7, 1861.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Hooper, 20.

[18] Robert S. Harper, The Ohio Press in the Civil War (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1964), 4.

[19] Hooper, 33.

[20] The Crisis, February 7, 1861.

[21] Ibid., January 31, 1861.

[22] Ibid., March 14, 1861.

[23] Ibid.

[24] George Brown Tindall, America: A Narrative History, 2nd edition (New York: W.W. Norton Co., 1988), 679.

[25] The Crisis, August 19, 1863.

[26] Ibid., January 27, 1864.

[27] Ibid., March 5, 1862.

[28] Ibid., January 7, 1863.

[29] Ibid., October 16, 1863.

[30] Ibid., December 31, 1862.

[31] Medary regularly devoted space in The Crisis to blasting Lincoln for causing the war. A typical emotional sentiment from September 16, 1863, read, "Mr. Lincoln called out immense armies and plunged the country into an immense civil war, such as the world never before witnessed--drenching the peaceful fields with human blood, involving the people in debts untold and incalculable--disturbing the interests of the civilized world."

[32] Ibid., March 11, 1863.

[33] Henry Clyde Hubbart, The Older Middle West 1840-1880: Its Social, Economic and Political Life and Sectional Tendencies Before, During and After the Civil War (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963), 149.

[34] Justin E. Walsh, To Print the News and Raise Hell: A Biography of Wilbur F. Storey (Durham, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1968), 170.

[35] This characterization is summarized from the first chapter of Frank L. Klement, *The Copperheads in the Middle West* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), 1-39. Prior to the Civil War, Peace-Democrats had been known as Progressive Western Democrats.

[36] *The Crisis*, March 20, 1863.

[37] George W. Knepper, *Ohio and Its People* (Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1989), 236.

[38] Ibid., November 19, 26, 1862.

[39] Roseboom, 411.

[40] *The Crisis*, June 1, 1863.

[41] Medary used instances such as this to link with and expound upon his disdain for those in authority. In *The Crisis*, he charged, "Vallandigham is under arrest as a traitor. Governor Tod is still at large. Judge ye of the Government that so judges men!" Ibid., June 1, 1863.

[42] Walsh, 3.

[43] *The Crisis*, September 16, 1863. In addition, Vallandigham campaign letters appeared in the 22 July, 12 August, 31 September and 21 October editions of *The Crisis*.

[44] Knepper, 245. Vallandigham returned to Ohio in 1864, but his political power base was gone and he turned to the practice of law. In 1871, while trying a case, he accidentally shot himself to death.

[45] Harper, *The Ohio Press in the Civil War*, 9.

[46] *The Crisis*, January 6, 1864.

[47] Ibid., March 11, 1863.

[48] Hooper. 32.

[49] *The Crisis*, March 16, 1864.

[50] The former comment originated in the *Metropolitan Record*, while the latter appeared in the *Freeman's Journal*, both were New York papers. Quoted in Harper, *Lincoln and the Press*, 341.

[51] *The Crisis*, June 1, 1864.

[52] Ibid.

[53] *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, November,8, 1864.

[54] Harper, Lincoln and the Press, 342.

[55] Eric J. Cardinal, "The Ohio Democracy and the Crisis of Disunion, 1860-1861," Ohio History, Vol. 86 (Winter 1977): 19.

[56] Ex Parte Milligan, was a landmark case, decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1866. Three Indiana Democrats, including Lambdin P. Milligan, were saved from the gallows by the decision. Justice David Davis read the opinion that: "Martial law can never exist where the courts are open. . . . The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances." 71 U.S. (4 Wallace) 1-143. Quoted in Frank L. Klement, The Limits of Dissent: Clement L. Vallandigham & The Civil War (Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1970), 321.

[57] Klement, 323.

[58] Richard Hofstadter, The American Political Tradition, and the Men Who Made It (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1948), 138.

[59] The Crisis, September 16, 1863.

[60] Dorn, 37. Also see Thalman Krumm Jr., "The Gethsemane Factor: A Historical Portrait of Samuel Medary of Ohio and an Analysis of the Rhetorical Dilemma of his Crisis years, 1861-1864" (Ph.D. diss., The Ohio State University, 1978). He notes, "For Medary and Lincoln the issue was the same: Save the Union. The question was, which one?"

AN ANALYSIS OF A WARTIME AGENDA:
THE KOREAN WAR REPORTING OF MARGUERITE HIGGINS

by

Mary M. Cronin

Mass Media Ph.D. candidate
School of Journalism
Michigan State Univ.
E. Lansing, MI. 48824

Presented to the History Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication at the 1990 annual convention, Minneapolis, Minn.

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF A WARTIME AGENDA:
THE KOREAN WAR REPORTING OF MARGUERITE HIGGINS

Marguerite Higgins' very personal style of Korean War reporting centered on a three-item agenda. First, she wanted Americans to understand the futility of sending poorly trained troops to war. She never criticized the military or the U.S. government directly, however. Her pro-military stance and patriotism stopped her. Instead, she achieved this goal via anecdotal accounts of the dangers the soldiers faced. Second, she wanted to provide her readers with a vivid account of the war, a far-away and little-understood conflict. Her writing, a mixture of first-person accounts and striking visual style provided her readers with a vicarious experience. Finally, she wanted her readers to understand that communism was a great evil that had to be countered by American might. Although it would be easy to accept such sentiments as Cold War rhetoric, Higgins' beliefs were a product of her post-WWII Eastern Europe reporting. Despite her beliefs, Higgins was able to rise above simple communist bashing and report on the enemy objectively.

AN ANALYSIS OF A WARTIME AGENDA:
THE KOREAN WAR REPORTING OF MARGUERITE HIGGINS

In late June 1950, two days after North Korea had sent its troops across the 38th parallel, Marguerite Higgins stepped off a plane from Tokyo and quickly found herself in the midst of a chaotic retreat from Seoul.

A somewhat veteran war correspondent -- she covered the tail end of World War II and won awards for her reports on the liberation of Dachau--Higgins' exploits in Korea, spurred by "a passionate, ruthless desire to cover war,"[1] made her "often as newsworthy as the event she was covering."[2] Her daredevil style did not begin in Korea, however. She had already made a name for herself during World War II, driving into unliberated portions of Germany and entering the civil war-torn nation of Poland alone.[3]

Higgins spent the first seven months of the Korean War with the Marines at the front lines. She risked her life repeatedly for stories, in part to scoop other reporters, especially her fellow New York Herald Tribune colleague Homer Bigart and in part because she was determined to show her editors and colleagues that she was a capable correspondent.[4] Higgins and Bigarts' dislike for each other, fueled by their incredible competitiveness, kept the two in separate parts of Korea for much of the war. A fellow correspondent said of the rivalry, "a delighted Herald Tribune sat back to enjoy some of the best coverage of the war while the dignified New York Times dispatched a task force to compete with Maggie and Homer."[5] Their work netted the two a Pulitzer in 1951 which they shared with four other correspondents.

Although six correspondents won Pulitzers for their coverage of the fighting, scholarly work on Korean War correspondents is thin compared to research of correspondents from other wars. Knightley's book, The First Casualty[6] and Mott's American Journalism[7] which both feature chapters on Korean War reporting are almost the extent of research to date on general Korean War journalism. Research about individual correspondents appears almost entirely lacking. Higgins, however, is the exception. A biography, Witness To War,[8] and chapters or mention in several books, most notably Marzolf's Up From The Footnote[9], Edward's Women of the World[10] and Mainiero's American Women Writers[11] mention Higgins in detail but are mainly anecdotal rather than analytical accounts. The type of coverage Higgins has received from scholars is not surprising as Higgins was an anomaly during the Korean war by virtue of being one of the few women covering the war.[12] A 1951 memoir about the war, War in Korea: The Report of a Woman Combat Correspondent, only increased her popularity when it became a bestseller and propelled Higgins to national recognition.[13]

The popular literature on Higgins parallels the scholarly work. A Newsweek[14] story about a "scoop" by Higgins about General Douglas MacArthur's plan to bomb North Korean airfields that caused a furor among other correspondents and a Time[15] magazine article focusing on Higgins's work as a temporary medic at the front lines were typical of the type of press she received. Yet it was her reporting, not her exploits, which brought news of this seemingly distant and little understood war into the homes of Americans. Lacking, then, is an understanding of her abilities as a journalist and her contributions as a war reporter.

Biographers have said Higgins' writing was not pioneering[16] but added that she would be remembered because she was fearless.[17] Other than such brief comments, no analysis of Higgins' reporting and writing, specifically her battlefront reports from Korea, exists. This research intends to remedy that gap by providing an analysis of her front-line reporting which took place during the first seven months (June 1950 to January 1951) of the Korean War. After January 1951 until the end of the war, Higgins' spent periods of time in the U.S. as well as in Korea. Her coverage, therefore, was not as consistent after January 1951.

Given that Higgins was one of the best-known correspondents of the war and her newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune, received wide readership, this research intends to examine what view of the war Higgins presented to her readers. An examination of her work revealed three agenda items evident throughout her writing. Higgins openly declared two of these items. First, she wanted Americans to understand the danger and futility of sending men too young, too ill-prepared and too ill-equipped to face an enemy.[18] Second, she claimed her job as a correspondent was to provide her readers with a vivid account of the Korean War, a far-away and little-understood conflict.[19] Finally, although she never admitted it outright, Higgins had a third agenda item -- she wanted to make clear to her readers that communism was a great evil that had to be countered by America. This research argues that the anti-communist stance evident in Higgins' articles was not merely the product of cold war rhetoric or the flames of patriotism, as critics of Korean war correspondents have claimed.[20] Rather, Higgins' anti-communist sentiments were a by-product of her WWII and post-WWII experiences as a correspondent in Eastern Europe.

Before examining her war reporting, it is important to understand the circumstances under which Higgins and her colleagues worked while covering the war.

Correspondents' Working Conditions

Although one military man at the time said the Korean War was the most heavily covered war (by journalists) of all time, that coverage was hampered by danger, poor communication, censorship, often confusing and chaotic fighting and personal hardship. While the war was fought on a smaller scale than WWII, both geographically and militarily, it was a war that proved to be almost as dangerous for correspondents as it was for soldiers. Six American correspondents (including photographers) were killed during the first full month of the war. By the time the truce was signed, 17 correspondents, including 10 Americans, were dead.[21]

If the hazards of the war were not enough for correspondents to cope with, poor communication facilities only made matters worse. In the early months of the war, reporters had only one telephone line to Japan. Calls were limited to three minutes. When the line was down or so many stories accumulated to create a serious backlog, reporters frequently flew to Japan, filed their stories and then flew back to Korea.[22] Chicago Daily News reporter Keyes Beech commented that obtaining a story took only five percent of a correspondent's effort. Getting the story out of Korea took the other ninety five percent.[23]

Adding to the difficulties was General Douglas MacArthur's refusal to impose military censorship. His request for self-censorship on the part of correspondents lead to confusion and a search for guidelines on coverage.[24] Many correspondents' early articles demonstrating military blunders and lack of preparedness angered top-ranking U. S. military officers, resulting in some reporters' accreditations being pulled while others were ordered out of Korea and sent back to their offices in Tokyo.[25] Censorship was not formally applied until January 1951 and then it was stringent. The military hung the threat of deportation and the unusual charge of court-martial out to correspondents and forbade correspondents to describe many aspects of the war including troop movements, locations of troops, troop strength, equipment, or weapons. The use of the word "retreat" in any dispatch also was prohibited.[26]

The conditions under which correspondents worked may have influenced their reporting abilities or even altered their writing. Higgins admitted in War in Korea that stress and exhaustion took their toll on her and many of her fellow correspondents. Fatigue was the key factor. Because most battlefronts in South

Korea could be reached by jeep in a matter of a few hours, most correspondents were continually on the run--watching a battle, filing a story and then heading off to the next battlefront. Tired correspondents sometimes sacrificed quality, grateful that they were able to get their stories written and sent via the telephone to their wire services, newspapers and radio stations. Reflecting on her writing after spending most of the first year at the front, a dismayed Higgins admitted that many of her stories were written when she was physically exhausted, leaving her disappointed with the writing and organization of every story.[27]

It was under these conditions that Higgins spent the first seven months of the war. These first seven months provided some of the most dramatic and strategic events of the war, including: the invasion of South Korea by the North Koreans, the fall of Seoul, the arrival of American and other U.N. troops, the invasion of Inchon, the American push to the Yalu River and the capture of Pyongyang, the entrance of the Chinese into the war and the Chosin Reservoir Battle. Higgins was at the front lines with the Marines for most of these events. Given this, what picture of the war did she present to her readers?

Military Unpreparedness

> "Are you correspondents telling the people back home the truth? Are you telling them that out of one platoon of twenty men, we have three left? Are you telling them that we have nothing to fight with, and that it is an utterly useless war?"[28]
>
> -- a Lieutenant talking to Higgins

The war Higgins found herself covering initially was marked by confusion over the reasons behind its outbreak. What is clear, however, is that when the North Koreans came across the 38th parallel on June 25, 1950, a series of tank-driven battlefront successes nearly ended the war in its first week. The speed at which the North Koreans gained ground led President Truman to send the nearest American troops to Korea to aid Syngman Rhee's government. The men of the 1/21st Infantry, a peacetime occupation force based in Japan, were flown into Korea on July 1st. Poorly equipped, badly understrength and soft from years of peacetime duty,[29] these soldiers also were hampered by other barriers, especially psychological ones. Many of these infantrymen were from poor, rural southern backgrounds. Lacking an understanding of their enemy, the men of the 1/21st were convinced that the North Koreans would beat a hasty retreat across the 38th parallel once they knew Americans were in Korea.[30] The Americans were convinced that the North Koreans were racially inferior, but as correspondent Keyes Beech pointed out, the enemy had one quality that the U.S. troops lacked -- a willingness to die.[31]

These first American troops, like many of their counterparts in Tokyo, had not joined the army to fight. They had joined, in many cases, to get out of economically depressed regions, to see the world or perhaps to get an education under the G.I. Bill.[32] Not surprisingly then, upon their arrival in Korea the troops claimed that they would be back in Tokyo by the weekend. Their first encounter with the North Koreans left twenty men killed or wounded and the rest bewildered.[33] Although most historians agree that the quality and training of U.S. troops improved steadily as the war went on, by the time the truce was signed, three years of war left 33,692 Americans dead and 105,785 wounded out of a total 1,319,000 American troops.[34]

Higgins' writing in the first few months of the war made no secret of the unprepared state of these early troops. Yet, she never criticized the Army or the U.S. government directly. Several factors may account for this. First, the speed of the North Korean invasion required sending the first available troops and Higgins undoubtedly recognized this fact. Furthermore, American war correspondents of this time did not have a history of providing detached and skeptical accounts of the war. Stone points out that many American reporters did not want to criticize the Army while battles were going on.[35] That type of reporting would not surface in large-scale until Vietnam. Higgins' lack of criticism or critical analysis of the military appears to go deeper than simply a hesitancy to criticize while battles were going on. For Higgins, the daughter of an Air Force officer who saw combat in WWI, admiration for the military and patriotism were prized values.[36] She did not give in to the pressures of appeals for patriotism as did other reporters.[37] She came to Korea already firm in her beliefs of the correctness of America's anti-communist causes across the globe.[38]

Although her work lacked direct criticism, Higgins' position as a reporter made her realize that her readers should know what type of war their sons and neighbors were fighting. Higgins stated in her autobiographical account of the war, War in Korea, that an informed American public opinion required that correspondents "tell graphically the moments of desperation and horror endured by an unprepared army, so that the American public will demand that it does not happen again."[39] Despite this claim, only some of her articles focused on the lack of preparedness. Most of her articles centered on the dangers the soldiers faced, mainly through anecdotal accounts. One of Higgins earliest articles told of soldiers armed with only rifles trying to fight off North Korean tanks.[40] Another article told of teen-age soldiers attempting to stop newly-designed tanks with old, ineffective WWII-style bazookas. The young soldiers, firing their weapons from a bad vantage point, were hammered by tank fire.[41] Higgins witnessed one of the first American soldiers to die during this skirmish. Although she saw him fall in battle, it was at a distance. Higgins waited until the body was recovered to write about it:

> The medics brought the dead soldier's body in here, tenderly lifting him from a jeep. The lifeless form was shrouded in a blanket which kept the pelting rain off the blond young face. As medics brought the body in, one young private said bitterly, "What a place to die!"[42]

The quotation in this passage not only indirectly showed Higgins' belief that America entered the war unprepared, it also forced Higgins' own emotions onto her readers. Similarly, she set her readers' emotional agenda about an extremely high casualty-ridden attack by Marines through her use of scenic description:

> "The baking, relentless sun collapsed some of the toughest marines of a battalion, which, in the struggle to gain its first assigned objective of this campaign, had to climb nearly sheer ridges rising thousands of feet out of the lush green valley."[43]

The stage set for readers, Higgins clinched the story in the next line: "Cases of heat exhaustion outnumbered all other casualties, which included lacerations from falls down cliffs."[44]

Higgins had no trouble telling her readers of the dangers and difficulties the Marines faced. The military had imposed no direct censorship at the start of the war. Only a voluntary and vague code aimed at preserving military secrecy was in place.[45]

As the war progressed, Higgins did not restrict her sentiments about the soldiers' conditions through explanation. She became more verbally critical, working her opinion into the stories. In a Saturday Evening Post article excerpted from her book War in Korea, about the Marines' bloody battle at the Chosin reservoir, Higgins described the battle as "A Korean Valley Forge and worse than anything in Marine history."[46] "When I looked at the survivors there at Hagaru, I wondered if they would have the will to make this final punch."[47]

Higgins' inclusion of personal criticism in her articles was not merely the product of bloody battle coverage. She had seen plenty before the early December Chosin retreat. Instead, the answer seems to lie in the fundamental shift in the attitudes of American soldiers and correspondents that occurred around mid-October of 1950 when the Chinese entered the war. Before the Chinese entered the war American soldiers had a geographic objective to fight for--the 38th parallel. Yet, they had achieved that and pushed even further in the fall, straight through North Korea to China's border. Sadly, this military victory by U.N. forces did not end the war. What the sweep through North Korea did cause was a feeling of pointlessness, especially for American soldiers. As Keyes Beech stated in his memoirs, there was no longer a point a soldier could say "we've won, we can go home." Furthermore, unlike WWII, there was no Rome, Tokyo or Berlin to aim for, only a political objective--fighting a small war (in Korea) to prevent a bigger war (an all-out WWIII).[48]

The Chosin reservoir battle, one of the U.S. Army's biggest miscalculations, gave Higgins some of her strongest copy on military unpreparedness but again her articles featured no direct criticism of the U.S. or the Army.

American military intelligence knew the Chinese were stationed near the Chosin reservoir in November of 1950, but the U.S. Army had greatly underestimated their strength and location. Some ten Chinese divisions had surrounded the Army and Marines and lay waiting in the trap they had set for the Americans.[49] The U.S. army, assuming far fewer Chinese, decided to send its soldiers in small groups on a "mopping up" exercise across the vast and rugged terrain that surrounded the reservoir.[50] The soldiers became trapped in a narrow valley surrounded by high mountains and thousands of Chinese. The overwhelming Chinese forces, the lack of cover and the bitter cold of North Korea took an exacting toll on the Marines. Only 385 of some 2,500 soldiers were found to be fit by the time they got out of the reservoir.[51] The battle was one of the bitterest of the war and Higgins, at the town of Hagaru at the end of the reservoir where the soldiers appeared, was there to tell her readers about the survivors:

> "The men were ragged, their faces swollen from the cold and bleeding from the raw bit of the icy wind, their ears blue. Their mittens were torn and raveled. Some were without their fur hats. A few walked barefoot. They had to--they could not get their frost bitten feet into their frozen shoepacs."[52]

For a later article in the Saturday Evening Post she recounted:

> "The Marines were so exhausted that they did not even bother to take cover at sporadic machine-gun and rifle fire. When someone was killed, they would wearily, matter-of-factly, go pick up the body, wrap it in a poncho and place it in the nearest truck."[53]

While Higgins achieved her goal of telling the events of the war graphically so that Americans would understand the dangers the soldiers faced, her writing only rarely provided a considered view of the war as a whole, or the importance of one battle to the war, to her readers. Occasionally when she was not directly at the front her writing reflected an attempt to explain the impact of a battle within the broader parameters of the war.[54] Higgins' writing may have lacked analysis because military strategy was not her strong suit. The scholarly literature and her two autobiographies do not shed light on this gap. Her only comment on battle strategy is that before going to the front she briefed herself carefully at Army headquarters then decided how to play each story.[55] Her lack of analysis also may be due in part to her reporting method. She was a front line reporter who preferred to get in the middle of a battle and write about it from the inside rather than attempt a lengthy analysis.

The Herald Tribune was not without consistent analysis of the war, however. Higgins' colleague, Homer Bigart, rounded out the paper's coverage of the war with just such analysis. For example, take two passages from his account of the Chosin Reservoir battle which ran parallel to Higgins' on page one:

> "Before the offensive was launched it was noted by observers that any attempt to push beyond the neck of the Korean Peninsula would be unsound, even if the Chinese Communists withdrew. To fan out a small force along the rugged fastness of a 700-mile frontier with Red China and the Soviet Union simply made no sense. It was an invitation to disaster."

> "Meanwhile, the 10th Corps faces the imminent prospect of a Dunkerque. Nor is the situation much better with the 8th Army. For although Gen. Walker's troops escaped entrapment north of Pyongyang, thanks mainly to the skillfully conducted withdrawal by the 1st Corps under Maj. Gen. Frank W. Milburn, they are no longer capable of regaining the initiative from the overwhelming Chinese Communist forces, and they eventually may be obliged to pull back into a defensive beachhead perimeter."[56]

Compared to Bigart, Higgins attempted to demonstrate the lack of unpreparedness and the dangers the American soldiers faced through a personal, eyewitness style. Her work described what it was like to watch the soldiers at battle: how they stormed hills, how they routed the enemy and how they died. Unlike Bigart's more analytical style, Higgins offered her readers the views of an observer, a sort-of written travelogue of destruction.

Vivid writing style

Although her articles lacked analysis, Higgins' use of visual imagery was an important device to aid readers in understanding the Korean War. At a time when television was still in its infancy, the newspaper reporters' dispatches were what brought news of this distant and seemingly foreign war into the homes of Americans. Radio was certainly in direct competition with newspapers at the time, but newspapers still had the advantage of being able to provide the depth of coverage that radio could not. Higgins used a vivid, descriptive style not so much to compete with radio and such well-known radiomen as Edward R. Murrow, but because she admitted that vivid description was the most natural way for her to write. And, she used description constantly.[57] If used properly, words not only told the story, they also made the reader a vicarious observer as is illustrated by this passage about the battle at Inchon:

> "The channel reverberated with the ear-splitting boom of warship guns and rockets. Blue and orange flames spurted from the 'Red Beach' area and a huge oil tank, on fire, sent great black rings of smoke over the shore. Then the fire from the big guns lifted and the planes that had been circling overhead swooped down low to rake their fire deep into the sea wall."[58]

Overall, Higgins' battle stories reflect two differing styles. When she could not get to the front, her news stories were essentially straight, factual accounts of the battle with occasional analysis. When she reported from the front, her articles primarily were written in the first person. These stories are marked not only by her penchant for visual description but also for her use of first-person reporting. Although first-person reporting was common to many of the war correspondents, Higgins used the first person often to extremes. While writing about battles, she frequently included the events that had happened to her within her stories. Sometimes she even put herself in the lead. In an article about the recapture of Kimpo airfield, Higgins' lead began: "I returned to Kimpo airfield tonight, just eighty-three days after I landed here on June 27, two days after the invasion of South Korea."[59] Higgins' "I was there" style shifted the focus from the capture of the airfield to her own experiences.

Other articles almost resembled letters, filled with her exploits and the adventures of those around her. These dispatches had an underlying sense of boastfulness--she was extremely close to fire of all kinds and she let her readers know this. During one attack on a military headquarters post, Higgins let her readers know about the ferocity of the fire by focusing the action around herself:

> We tried to race down the hall toward the main telephone room but we had to hit the floor fast and stay there. We were pinned down for fifteen minutes as bullets ripped past, tearing up the wooded flooring and walls.[60]

Higgins' editors not only did not object to her first person style, but gave substantial play to the fact that she was one of the few women correspondents in Korea, mentioning her personally in headlines and subheads. Occasionally her photograph also accompanied her stories.

The technique did lead to exciting copy. A paragraph from her report on the Marine invasion of Inchon, the story that netted Higgins the Pulitzer and was claimed by Higgins to be the best Korean story she wrote, demonstrates her participant observation style:

> "We struck the sea wall hard at a place where it had crumbled into a canyon. The bullets were whining persistently, spattering the water around us. We clambered over the high, steel sides of the boat, dropped into the water and taking shelter beside the boat as long as we could, snaked on our stomachs up into a rock-strewn dip in the sea wall."[61]

Higgins' account of the Inchon invasion is typical of many of her front line dispatches as it followed a loose, chronological form. Unlike true narratives, which stay faithful to telling the events that occurred in sequence, Higgins' stories tell the information in a timely order but are interspersed with quotations from soldiers and civilians, personal observations and anecdotes about her own actions, and vivid, often striking, descriptions of the fighting. Her non-descriptive passages often lapse into awkward phrasing or demonstrate poor word choice, yet as critics have said, her strong visual style was indeed compelling and saved her writing. Higgins' lack of polished writing may be attributable in large part to her lack of time spent in the proximity of her editors. She had only worked at the Herald Tribune for two years before heading off to Europe at the age of 23 to cover the end of WWII.[62] From the end of that war through the Korean War, Higgins rarely worked in the Herald Tribune's New York offices. Her minimal brush with editorial guidance was telling in her copy.

Despite her looser chronological style, her stories are cohesive and the quotations and descriptions are effective as vicarious devices.

Political Sentiments

While Higgins was writing about the Marines battling communist invaders in a far-away land, another type of war--the Cold War--was in force back in America. The anti-communist fervor that had been rising throughout the United States since the end of the WWII had reached its peak when the Korean War began. One media critic said Korea was "the deadly parallel to McCarthy. One bolstered the other, and the press bolstered both."[63] In her memoirs, Higgins did not hide her belief that the war in Korea was indeed the military arm of the Cold War. She viewed Korea as the location where the U.S. took on "Red aggression" head-on.[64] Other correspondents held similar views. In a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Keyes Beech said winning the war was not the main question of the times. The real question "is rather simple, namely, how do we best go about defeating communism?"[65]

Higgins' hawkish attitude toward communists also was no secret to her editors. Convinced that America was in a fight to the finish with communists over the Sovietization of the world, she called on the democratic nations of the world to use diplomacy and great military might to "bring about the liberation of that part of the world now gripped by Soviet imperialism."[66]

In her book War in Korea, Higgins stated:

> It is just barely possible that if we confront the enemy with obviously superior armed strength at every important testing point in the world, he will back down without a fight. But I doubt it. There may be

> strategic halts in the Communist-armed expansion, halts of several years. They will be merely periods of regroupment. The Third World War is on."[67]

Not surprisingly, then, readers of Higgins' work found a pattern of anti-communist sentiments woven throughout her stories. One of Higgins' articles, titled "Korean Prospect: A Fighting Retreat" was in fact, a politically interpretive article which focused on several aspects of the war including why the United States must defeat the communists.[68] Despite the article's interpretive nature, Higgins' editors did not label this story as commentary. The lack of the label appears to have been editorial policy. The Herald Tribune was firmly anti-communist in tone from its publisher on down to its reporters.[69] The paper's editorials, while conservative and calling for Washington to show restraint by keeping American troops at home when the North Koreans crossed the parallel, gave full support to the President and the war effort once troops had been committed.[70]

The Herald Tribune's conservative, anti-communist editorial policy also can be seen in headlines written for Higgins's articles, such as "Reds Beat Drums in Inchon, But Couldn't Sell Communism,"[71] and "Flaming Seoul Cheers Weary G.I. Liberators."[72]

Several forces may have helped shape Higgins' beliefs. The primary factor, as mentioned previously, was Higgins' role as a reporter in Eastern Europe, and primarily Poland, at the end of World War II. While reporting on Poland she witnessed that nation's struggle against Soviet-imposed communism. The events aroused her political consciousness, a fact she frequently admitted. "And it was a miserable personal experience to watch the death struggle of these nations . . . By the time the Korean War exploded, I was beginning to take this Russian pushing around very personally."[73]

A Korean story concerning the methods the communists used during their period of rule in the South Korean port city of Inchon makes parallels to Poland:

> "The Communists moved in quickly on the Inchon municipal government, bringing in their own leaders and ordering execution or arrest of all prominent anti-Communists. They took over control of food and then--as was done so well in Poland--used the distribution of rice as a political weapon."[74]

Higgins also told her readers that the communists had stripped factories of their heavy machinery and shipped it north of the 38th parallel. Land owners had their land repossessed and redistributed, and pictures of the North Korean leader Kim Il Sung were liberally pasted up throughout the city.[75] Although the Inchon article is not written in Higgins' traditional first person style, it again shows her strength as a descriptive writer.

The Cold War beliefs and values of the time period in which Higgins worked also cannot be discounted as factors that influenced her writing, however, given that her anti-communist beliefs developed prior to the Korean War, the anti-communist fervor of the 1950s seem more likely to have perpetuated and reinforced her beliefs rather than developed them.

Higgins demonstrated the evils of communism in pointed fashion within many of her articles. For example, in her dispatch about the third retreat from Seoul, she stated:

> "Never have I seen so many tears -- wailing children, sobbing mothers, the aged weeping with weakness and anxiety.
>
> The people of Seoul, having tasted Red rule once, want no part of it. One could see everywhere how well they had learned the lesson of the previous occupation. This time every one went, and all took everything they could with them."[76]

Higgins' articles reflected anti-communist sentiments primarily by focusing on communist atrocities. One article, from August of 1950 titled "Boy P.W.s Say Reds Compelled Them to Fight" tells the story captured 15- and 16-year-old North Korean and South Korean boy soldiers who were inducted into the North Korean army by gunpoint or beatings. They were given the choice of either being used as cannon fodder in first-wave battle attacks or being shot in the back by North Korean soldiers if they refused to charge at American soldiers.[77] Other stories, particularly battle stories, focused on communist atrocities directed at American soldiers. For example, as the Marines fought their way out the Chosin reservoir, perhaps their most vicious battle of the war, Higgins told readers that:

> "They (the marines) . . . had suffered anguish when, time after time, Chinese swooped into their midst flinging phosphorous hand grenades into truckloads of screaming wounded.[78]

Yet, Higgins did not let her political beliefs cloud her ability to judge the enemy. She never wrote off the North Koreans and Chinese as being racially inferior. In fact, throughout the war Higgins told her readers that the both the North Koreans and Chinese were forces to be reckoned with. Her series of articles on the recapture of Seoul in September 1950 reiterated the North Koreans' abilities as deadly accurate fighters who held the city for a week before having to fall back.[79] Entering Seoul with the Marines, Higgins repeatedly had to take shelter throughout the 26th of September as North Korean snipers armed with machine guns rained bullets down on the Marines causing many fatalities.[80]

Paralleling her anti-communist rhetoric, Higgins, as expected, portrayed American soldiers as valiant fighting men--brave and loyal liberators who were freeing South Korea from the clutches of the communist North Koreans. Her dispatches told readers of the wounded sergeant who, despite a leg injury and heavy enemy fire, directed his men throughout the battle. The same story also told of an medical corpsman injured by mortar fire who immediately resumed treating the wounded once he regained consciousness.[81]

Similar stories told of "kindly" American G.I.s sharing their rations with hungry children.[82] Other stories told of the officer who refused to desert his wounded men despite orders from his superiors,[83] and the humane treatment of North Korean and Chinese P.O.W.s by American soldiers.[84]

The pro-American sentiments reverberated throughout Higgins's articles are found primarily in descriptive, eye-witness passages within her accounts of battles and their aftermaths. Higgins' pro-American beliefs, admiration for the Marines and contempt for communism appeared to be the primary factors in shaping her portrayal of the soldiers.

Discussion

The strength of Marguerite Higgins' Korean war correspondence lay in her ability to report the war from a very personal standpoint. Although only a fair writer, she used her talent as a visual reporter to provide her readers with the vicarious experience they needed to gain an understanding of the war. She also used her visual form of writing to tell her readers about how unprepared America's first Korean War troops were. She never criticized the Army or the American government directly, however. Instead, she got her point across with anecdotal accounts of the dangers the troops were facing. Her admiration for the military, her fervent patriotism and her firm anti-communist beliefs kept her from overt criticism despite high casualty rates in the early months of the war. As the war progressed and its end grew vague, Higgins' writing included strong judgment statements about casualties and conditions.

Perhaps her biggest weakness as a correspondent was that her articles about individual battles lacked perspective on the broader issue of the war. She primarily provided her readers with vivid frontline accounts, but failed to explain the significance of these battles in relation to the war as a whole. Yet, her newspaper's readers were not without perspective on the war as fellow correspondent Homer Bigart provided more thoughtful, critical articles about the war.

Much of her battlefront reporting relied on a first-person style of writing which became intrusive in her stories at times when she focused the battles primarily around her own actions. When the first-person writing was less intrusive, it gave Higgins credibility--she was there, she knew what she was writing about.

Evident in her writing was a perpetual current of anti-communist beliefs. Higgins was convinced that America was in a fight to the finish with communism. By using anecdotal accounts, she wanted Americans to understand the evils of communism. Although it would be easy to accept such sentiments as simply the product of the Cold War era in which she worked, Higgins' beliefs appear to have come from her post-WWII experiences in covering Poland. The anti-communist ferver so evident in much of American culture and other war correspondents simply bolstered and perpetuated Higgins' beliefs. Yet despite her values and beliefs, Higgins was able to rise above simple communist bashing and provide her readers with a critical and objective view of the enemy.

1. Antoinette May, Witness to War, (New York: Penguin Books, 1983), 135.

2. "Maggie," Newsweek, 17 January 1966, 83.

3. Julia Edwards, Women of the World, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1988), 191.

4. Marguerite Higgins, War in Korea: Report of a Woman War Correspondent, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1951), 18.

5. Keyes Beech, Tokyo and Points East, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1955), 171.

6. Phillip Knightley, The First Casualty, (New York: Harvest Books, 1975).

7. Frank Luther Mott, American Journalism, (New York: The MacMillian Co., 1962).

8. Witness To War.

9. Marion Marzolf, Up From the Footnote, (New York: Hastings House, 1977).

10. Women of the World, 188-201

11. Lina Mainiero, ed. American Women Writers, (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1980), 294-296.

12. Many popular sources including Time magazine claimed that Higgins was the only woman to cover Korea. This is not true. However, Higgins did appear to be the only woman correspondent at least during the first few months of the war. Three weeks into the war, Higgins was ordered out of Korea because she was a woman by Lieutenant General Walton H. Walker. Higgins appealed to General Douglas MacArthur who rescinded the order.

She may also have been the only front-line female correspondent. The evidence is too sketchy to reach a definitive conclusion. Either way, Higgins did not discourage the notoriety she was receiving back home for being "the only woman" to cover the Korean war.

13. American Women Writers, 295.

14. "This Time, Korea," Newsweek, 10 July 1950, 54-55.

15. "Pride of the Regiment," Time, 25 September 1950, 63-64.

16. Women of the World, 191.

17. Ibid, 201.

18. War in Korea, 96-97.

19. Marguerite Higgins, News is a Singular Thing, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1955), 209.

20. I.F. Stone, the Hidden History of the Korean War, (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1952), 345-347; James Aronson, The Press and the Cold War, (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1970), 107; Philip Knightley, The First Casualty, (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1975), 347.

21. American Journalism, 857.

22. War in Korea, 51.

23. Tokyo and Points East, 152.

24. "Situation Not Normal," Newsweek, 25 September 1950, 51.

25. Ibid, 51; "Needed: A Rule Book," Time, 24 July 1950, 58; "The Lid Goes On," Time, 1 January 1951, 47.

26. "Rigid Korean News Censorship Rules Out Use of Word 'Retreat'," New York Herald Tribune, 10 January 1951, 1-2.

27. War in Korea, 51.

28. War in Korea, 84.

29. Max Hastings, The Korean War (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987), 11.

30. Ibid., 17.

31. Tokyo and Points East, 146.

32. Tokyo and Points East, 146.

33. The Korean War, 18.

34. Ibid., 329.

35. The Hidden History of the Korean War, 346.

36. News is a Singular Thing, 26.

37. The First Casualty, 356.

38. War in Korea, 16.

39. Ibid., 96-97.

40. Marguerite Higgins, "U.S. Troops Attacked by Planes, Maybe by an Ally or Americans," New York Herald Tribune, 4 July 1950, 1.

41. Marguerite Higgins, "Death of First Infantryman: Woman Reporter Sees the Battle," New York Herald Tribune, 6 July 1950, 1.

42. Ibid, 2.

43. Marguerite Higgins, "This is Worse than Iwo Jima," New York Herald Tribune, 9 August 1950, 1.

44. Ibid, 1.

45. The First Casualty, 337.

46. Marguerite Higgins, "The Bloody Trail Back," Saturday Evening Post, 27 January 1951, 30.

47. Ibid., 119.

48. Tokyo and Points East, 203-204.

49. Max Hastings, The Korean War, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987), 149.

50. Clay Blair, The Forgotten War, (New York: Times Books, 1987), 387.

51. The Korean War, 154.

52. Marguerite Higgins, "On the Battlefronts in Korea," New York Herald Tribune, 6 December 1950, 1 & 11.

53. "The Bloody Trail Back," 120.

54. For example see: Marguerite Higgins, "Allies Fall Back 25 Miles in Mountains," New York Herald Tribune, 6 January 1951, 1-2.

55. News is a Singular Thing, 209.

56. Homer Bigart, "On the Battlefronts in Korea," New York Herald Tribune, 6 December 1950, 1-2.

57. War in Korea, 96-97.

58. Marguerite Higgins, "Story of the Landing," New York Herald Tribune, 18 September 1950, 4.

59. Marguerite Higgins, "Korean Girl, 17, Helps Marines In Fighting For Kimpo Airfield," New York Herald Tribune, 19 September 1950, 1.

60. Marguerite Higgins, "Reds Shoot Americans' Coffee Off Table in Breakfast Attack," New York Herald Tribune, 4 August, 1950, 2.

61. Marguerite Higgins, "Story of the Landing," New York Herald Tribune, 18 September 1950, 4.

62. Anna Rothe, ed. "Marguerite Higgins," Current Biography 1951, (New York: H.W. Wilson Co, 1951), 274.

63. The Press and the Cold War, 103.

64. War in Korea, 16.

65. Speech by Keyes Beech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Transcript reprinted in Problems of Journalism, proceedings of the ASNE, Washington, D. C., 1951.

66. "Miss Higgins Says Korea Awoke America to Communist Danger," New York Herald Tribune, 26 October 1950, 21.

67. War in Korea, 17.

68. Marguerite Higgins, "Korean Prospect: A Fighting Retreat," New York Herald Tribune, 3 January 1951, 1 and 4.

69. Richard Kluger, The Paper, (New York: Vintage Books, 1986), 470-471.

70. See "Naked Aggression," New York Herald Tribune, 26 June 1950, 12; "The Bolder the Safer," New York Herald Tribune, 27 June 1950, 26; "A Calculated Risk for Peace," New York Herald Tribune, 28 June 1950, 22; and, "The Will of the People," New York Herald Tribune, 29 June 1950, 26 for example. A survey by the author of this paper of the Herald Tribune's editorials for the first seven months of the war found unwavering support for the U.S. cause.

71. Marguerite Higgins, "Reds Beat The Drums In Inchon, But Couldn't Sell Communism," New York Herald Tribune, 18 September 1950, 3.

72. Marguerite Higgins, "Flaming Seoul Cheers Weary G.I. Liberators," New York Herald Tribune, 28 September 1950, 4.

73. Marguerite Higgins, News is a Singular Thing, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co. Inc.), 218.

74. "Reds Beat Drums in Inchon, But Couldn't Sell Communism," 3.

75. Ibid., 3.

76. Marguerite Higgins, "The Flight from Seoul," *New York Herald Tribune*, 4 January 1951, 1.

77. Marguerite Higgins, "Boy P. W.s Say Reds Compelled Them to Fight," *New York Herald Tribune*, 1 August 1950, 2.

78. "The Bloody Trail Back," 119.

79. See the following articles: Marguerite Higgins, "Reds in Seoul Forcing G.I.s to Blast City Apart," *New York Herald Tribune*, 25 September 1950, 3; and, Marguerite Higgins, "Inside Seoul: Marines Gain Inch by Inch," *New York Herald Tribune*, 27 September 1950, 3.

80. "Inside Seoul: Marines Gain Inch by Inch," 3.

81. Marguerite Higgins, "'This is Worse Than Iwo Jima,' Marines Say Winning a Ridge," *New York Herald Tribune*, 9 August 1950, 1 and 35.

82. Marguerite Higgins, "Seoul Taking Revenge on Its Fifth Column," *New York Herald Tribune*, 29 September 1950, 3.

83. "Inside Seoul: Marines Gain Inch by Inch," 3.

84. Ibid., 3.

Journalism Cultural History: "Much Ado About Nothing"

Bonnie Sue Brennen

Prepared for the AEJMC National Convention, Minneapolis, Minnesota
August 8-12, 1990

Historians relate, not so much what is done, as what they would have believed.—Benjamin Franklin

The facts of history do not exist for any historian till he creates them.—Carl Becker

History is the biography of society in all its departments.—Frederick Jackson Turner

In 1974 James W. Carey called for the creation of cultural history, as an alternative to the reigning liberal pluralist paradigm of journalism history. This paper begins with Carey's call and considers the concept of cultural history, its roots and the type of alternative it offers to journalism historiography. Journalism cultural history is shown to have roots in social history, progressive history, and pragmatism, rather than British Cultural Studies and is seen to be a distinctively American school of thought. Carey's concept of cultural history, locked into a liberal pluralist framework does not provide a meaningful alternative to journalism historiography. This paper suggests that researchers who are interested in alternative interpretations work outside the liberal pluralist framework, consider a Marxist perspective of history, and investigate questions regarding ideology, power, and domination.

CAREY'S CALL

In his article "The Problem of Journalism History," Carey calls for a fresh perspective of the study of journalism history to "ventilate" previous historical interpretations. This new interpretation, which he defines as cultural history, is an attempt to elucidate the attitudes, emotions, motivations, and expectations of individuals involved in historical events. Cultural history is not interested in the mere events and actions of the past but in the thought behind those actions and events. Carey considers the task of cultural history to be the "recovery of past forms of imagination, of historical consciousness." Three assumptions are implicit in this study of past consciousness: first, that there exists a history of consciousness; second, that the imaginations individuals have of each other are the "solid facts of society;" and third, that although individuals' actions are generally uniform, the imaginations of these individuals, regarding such actions, are diverse (Carey 1974, 4).

In order to understand historical events, researchers must look beyond the actual situations and consider the motivation of each individual involved in an event:

> If most men march off to war, they do so in the grip of quite different imaginations: some march to recover holy lands for their God, others to protect their nations from foreign devils, others reluctantly and sullenly as the exploited slaves of an imperial power. The facts of warfare give none of this information directly, but the significance of military action lies in how it is imagined (Carey 1974, 4).

Carey's goal of cultural history is the discovery of a historical consciousness for each specific period of time, which is thought to be possible by examining the imaginations of those individuals who actually experienced specific events. How did the participants feel about their "quality of life," what did they think about, or dream about, what were their goals and aspirations, what motivating factors influenced their decisions? In short what was it like for them to live in their particular period of history?

Carey's concept of the imagination comes from Charles H. Cooley, an American pragmatist who argues that the notion of society exists primarily within the human mind. An individual is considered to act directly from information formed in his or her mind, based on perceptions that person has of others. The individual rejects other information that does not correspond to these perceptions and subsequently creates a social reality from personal ideas. In order to create a society, it is thought to be necessary for individuals to "get together somewhere" and that place, for Cooley, is in the mind. Cooley does not comprehend how anyone can know another "except as imaginative ideas in the mind," and he therefore suggests that individuals and society must be studied primarily in the imagination, which he considers to be "the solid facts of society" (Cooley 1956, 120-121).

People are thought to be created from interaction with others, through what is known as the "looking glass self." This concept suggests that as individuals look at themselves in the mirror, they are interested not only in their appearance but in what they imagine others to perceive to be their "appearance, manners, aims, deeds, character, and friends." Each individual is thought to be influenced by the "imagined effect of this reflection upon another's mind" (Cooley 1956, 184). Individuals are not considered to become real by physical contact but instead through creation in the imagination, in relation to the individual's notion of a person and the remainder of his or her mind.

Carey seems to appropriate Cooley's concept of the imagination without considering his individual motivations or the historical context of his work. Cooley wrote during a period of American history when vast numbers of immigrants entered the United States. Efforts were made, during this period, to successfully incorporate these immigrants into American culture. In creating reality and society within the imagination, great numbers of "the unwashed" could be assimilated into society without physically dealing with their individual needs. As John Peters suggests:

> By making society the interplay of imaginations, Cooley found a solution to the problem of making society visible. Each citizen can gain a panoramic view of an elusive entity if sufficiently imaginative. In short, Cooley made the simulation of society by each individual a fundamental task of American democracy (Peters 1989a, 257).

CULTURE AND COMMUNICATION

Thus by creating society within the imagination, vast numbers of immigrants could be incorporated into American culture. Carey's concept of culture comes from Clifford Geertz, a contemporary anthropologist who, along with sociologist Max Weber believes "that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun." Culture is seen to be those webs and an analysis of culture is "therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning": (Geertz 1973, 5) The challenge, according to Carey, is to "grasp hold of the meanings people build into their words and behavior and to make these meanings, these claims about life and experience, explicit and articulate" (Carey 1977, 421). It is from these meanings people attach to their actions that this American sense of culture is to be understood. This definition of culture envisions the individual to be utilizing a wide variety of cultural forms, in the creation of his or her own reality; it sees the individual as a rational creature embodied with the power to help create culture (Carey 1977, 423).

Culture and communication are viewed by Carey to be closely allied because it is in language itself that "a shared culture is created, modified, and transformed." Carey chooses the European ritual model of communication rather than the traditional American model of transmission. The ritual model is seen as not being "directed toward the extension of messages in space, but the maintenance of society in time; not the act of imparting information or influence, but the creation, representation, and celebration of shared beliefs" (Carey 1977, 412).

John Dewey is one of Carey's heroes, "not for any one book or article but for an extended lifetime of courageous public and intellectual service" (Carey 1989a, 265) He shares Dewey's unshakable commitment to democracy, his belief that individuals can create a democratic society and agrees that democracy is "the universal end-point to which any attempt to build a social order based on the full realization of human potential will arrive" (Peters 1989b, 204). The individual is considered to have power to create and control his or her own destiny without interference from outside economic and political powers, pressures or controls. The decline of individualism in contemporary mass produced society is not considered; individuals are seen as free agents who create their own culture through interaction with other individuals oblivious to outside pressures of power and dominance.

Carey does not analyze the influence of power on culture and dismisses the "strategy of treating culture as power or domination or ideology" as a magic act that attempts to "dispose of the phenomenon by renaming it" (Carey 1988, 13). His view of culture rejects an analysis of conflict between classes and factions operating within the United States. He suggests that if American Cultural Studies were to consider how power, conflict, and domination influence culture, as British Cultural Studies does, that it would run the risk of becoming a "dismal science" where the "phenomenological diversity of society is reduced to the single quest for power and domination" (Carey 1989b, 106). Carey is concerned that by speaking of power and domination, all other considerations would be dismissed and a one dimensional interpretation of culture would result. However, by rejecting any consideration of power and domination it is Carey's definition itself that runs the risk of reducing culture to a one dimensional interpretation of life.

Carey considers cultural history to be an alternative to the dominant paradigm of journalism history, the Whig interpretation, which has "viewed the history of the press as one steadily advancing the cause of freedom and knowledge" (Reilly 1985, 38). These press histories are "dominated by considerations of white middle-class interests which support the impression of a rather homogeneous press, engaged in economic competition which ideologically united behind the notion of a democratic system" (Hardt 1989b, 4). It is important to note that Carey is not dismissing the Whig interpretation of journalism history; he is instead, looking for a fresh perspective to add additional meanings to previous work. Carey feels that the Whig interpretation is not wrong, it has merely become "an exhausted genre" in need of fresh interpretations (Reilly 1985, 47).

The Whig interpretation, also known as progressive journalism history, is the interpretation of the conflict that exists between "good" and "evil." These histories are the story of the struggle of "good" forces such as freedom, democracy, liberalism and libertarianism against "evil" forces such as repression, conservatism, aristocracy, and authoritarianism. The "good" is always shown to triumph over the "evil" and results in linear and unbounded progress (McKerns 1977, 88).

If it initially appears that Carey is calling for the exploration of all options and interpretations in the creation of cultural history, it soon becomes apparent that this is not the case. Carey operates strictly from within a liberal pluralist conception of society, and only those interpretations that are reconcilable with that framework are examined. At no time are explanations that question the status quo considered. A pluralist conception of society, as exemplified by Carey, "sees the cultural functions in the society as essential to the production and maintenance of a democratic society" (Eason and Fogo 1987, 5).

Power is seen to be diffused among groups and interests who compete for dominance in an ever-changing power structure. This active conflict and competition is thought to insure that no one group or interest maintain power for more than a brief period of time. Visible results from visible contests for influence are thought to decide on the "locus of power" (Westergaard 1977, 96). The media are seen to help maintain this democratic balance by providing access to rival pressures, educating the public, and by providing a "largely autonomous voice" (Duncum 1987, 1). Journalists are thought to occupy a vital role as keepers of the public conscience as they serve as "watchdogs on behalf of the silent majority, bloodhounds for ever on the scent of corruption, and abuse of power, pretense and incompetence" (Westergaard 1977, 96). Since power is assumed to be diffused, the possibility of dominance by a single interest is not considered. In addition, the media are never envisioned as vehicles of social or political power that may contribute to inequality within society. Within this pluralist democratic framework, Carey would consider the different imaginations of individuals as they marched off to war, but he would not question the political ideology that was instrumental in the country's entrance in that war, nor the economic forces that influenced the decision.

Carey's call has influenced considerable discussion among journalism historians who debate his concept specifically and in relation to journalism historiography as a whole. David Paul Nord rejects Carey's notion of cultural history in favor of a closer examination of institutional history (Nord 1988, 14); Michael

Emery views cultural history to be only one option in a series of new interpretations available to the study of journalism history (Emery 1983, 43), and Garth S. Jowett looks to interpretations in general history for help in the writing of journalism history. Marion Marzolf (Marzolf 1975, 42-43 and 1978, 1) and Jean Ward urge cultural history to adopt an interdisciplinary stance and to turn to fiction, art, and music as sources of cultural values and attitudes (Ward 1978, 1). Cathy Covert suggests the narrowness of journalism history comes from a "city desk mentality" (Covert 1974, 32), while John D. Stevens and Hazel Dicken Garcia suggest the narrowness is due to a lack of critical historiography (Stevens and Garcia 1980, 31) and Richard A. Schwarzlose looks to the use of additional data to offer journalism history new interpretations (Schwarzlose 1975, 38-39).

These journalism historians discuss specific alternatives for journalism history yet they generally accept without question the liberal pluralist ideology which drives their research. An underlying assumption found in their work is that cultural history has been influenced by British Cultural Studies (Heller 1990). This is however a false assumption; cultural history has roots in social history, progressive history, and pragmatism, and is a distinctly American school of thought which incorporates nothing from British Cultural Studies except its name.

SOCIAL HISTORY

There are close ties between cultural and social history and in some instances they may be one and the same; for example, cultural historian Robert Darnton who views cultural history as the attempt to understand the meaning of life "by providing access to answers that others have made in the daily rounds of their existence as well as in the formal organization of their ideas centuries ago" (Darnton 1990, xix) uses the terms interchangeably (Darnton 1982, 327-349). In general terms social history is defined as the history of society, its social structures, its processes, and its trends (Conze 1967, 7). It focuses on a concern with "the general membership of a society" rather than with only members of the elite population; it studies this population and the framework of their existence (Stearns 1982, 212). Some historians suggest social history:

> embraces the whole range of life and culture in societies that have existed in historical time. Others have insisted that its concern is most properly confined to a residuum left by the abstraction of the polity, the economy, and large areas of culture, such as religious beliefs and technology. Still others have restricted it more narrowly to a heterogeneous lot of domestic and communal institutions, customs, attitudes, and artifacts (Hecht 1968, 455).

The field of social history is diverse in the content it explores: "black history, urban history, labor history, the history of women, of criminality, sexuality, the oppressed, the inarticulate, the marginal," (Darnton 1982, 329) and varied in its focus on the economic, political, religious and intellectual aspects of such research. However, all social history focuses on the relationships that occur from human interaction. It seeks to understand patterns of human relationships which emerge and change within society (Hays 1971, 317) and it is in these patterns of culture, within society, that cultural and social history meet. The study of the "mentalities" is but one example of this overlap. Darnton refers to "'l 'histoire des mentalites" as cultural history, in which historians treat their own civilization in the same way anthropologists study alien cultures (Darnton 1984, 3). Social historians see the history of "mentalities" to have been stimulated by an interest in "common people" which has "dealt largely with the individually inarticulate, undocumented, and obscure and is often indistinct from an interest in their social movements or in more general phenomena of social behavior" (Hobsbawm 1971, 37).

AMERICAN CULTURAL HISTORY

In addition to the commonalties that Carey's concept of cultural history share with social history, a link exists to a tradition of American cultural history, which dates back to at least 1940 and the release of Caroline F. Ware's book The Cultural Approach to History. In this book Ware explains that cultural historians strive to apply anthropologists concept of "whole culture" to an:

> understanding of the patterns of societies, the groups, institutions, and ideologies that characterizes these societies. This concept of culture implies any given society is whole, in which basic processes of living are characteristic of social relationships which constitute a pattern of social behavior (Ware 1940, 10).

Ware's text reflects changes that affected historiography during the 1930s; the book is a response to objective historians who are intent on allowing the facts to speak for themselves. To these historians she asks the question: "which facts?" (Ware 1940, 3) Although these historians acknowledge no basis for the selection and interpretation of their evidence, Ware suggests that objective historians ask questions and present data that is "largely determined by their own social outlook," (Ware 1940, 4) an outlook that is influenced by an association with the elite members of society. The cultural approach is suggested by Ware as a viable alternative for the historian; this approach considers all aspects of life within each unique society. To Ware culture is not a "static frame in which to analyze history" but rather an process of change that is implicit in each society (Ware 1940, 13).

In writing history from the bottom up, it is suggested that cultural historians incorporate a local focus and utilize materials which:

> throw light on mass behavior as well as on the behavior of individuals; they must reveal activities not ordinarily a matter of formal record; they must deal with the inarticulate as well as the articulate groups in society; they must make it possible, to reach down into the home and community where the details of life are lived (Ware 1940, 273).

PROGRESSIVE HISTORY

Ware traces the roots of cultural history to progressive historian Charles Beard who is credited with adding an economic interpretation to political history.`In his book An Economic

Interpretation of the Constitution, Beard's aim was to introduce a note of realism into historical studies on the Constitution. Beard saw the Constitution as a product of class conflict. He suggested that even in a revered document such as the Constitution, political ideas and actions were not the result of a self-contained group of ideas but were instead the result of dynamic relations between specific interest groups, one dominated by urban capitalists and the other by farmers and planters (Hofstadter 1968, 243).

Beard analyzed the distribution of economic power in the United States in 1787, itemized each Constitutional Convention delegate's property holdings and concluded that the majority of the delegates "stood to gain personally from the adoption of the Constitution, chiefly because it would protect the public credit and raise the value of the public securities they held" (Higham 1968, 35) As early as 1913, Beard attempted to apply a historical sociology of knowledge to American society. He is credited as being the first historian to consider civilization as a whole and to have included the role of women, the family, and the daily life of the working classes in his research, at a time when the majority of historians would not (Genovese 1976, 33).

Other progressive historians joined Beard's critical ferment and his interest in viewing society as a whole. Frederick Jackson Turner, attempted to make historians aware of their own presuppositions and argued that history was more than politics, diplomacy, constitutions, and battles. It should not only consider "the doings of a ruling elite, but must deal with the full range of human activities and with the life of the common man"

(Hofstadter 1968, 72). Turner introduced one of his students, Carl Becker, to the concepts that each generation must rewrite history and that "progress for the common man was a desirable philosophy of history" (Brown 1970, 13). Becker came to believe objectivity was impossible and when Beard modified his economic interpretation to include a form of historical relativism, which was based on a historian's judgment about the nature and direction of history as a whole, Becker joined Beard.

Beard suggested than any selection and arrangement of historical facts must be controlled by the "frame of reference" in the mind of each historian (Commager 1976, 86). Although there is some history that is easily agreed to, Beard suggested that there were areas of historical understanding which are major "phases of the drama of human existence" that are affected by fundamental human loyalties. In these situations, no historian is capable of discerning more than "a partial and biased version of the past" (Hofstadter 1968, 306-7) Beard's historical relativism was not an unlimited relativism; he saw each historical interpretation to be of only three possible alternatives: "history as flux or chaos, history as a process of cyclical recurrence, or history as progressive development 'on an upward gradient toward a more ideal order'" (Braeman 1976, 61).

In general, progressive historians were enamored with pragmatism, as they worked to make history relevant to the political and intellectual issues of early twentieth century. Beard had become acquainted with Dewey while at Columbia, and is considered to be the first major historian to bring pragmatism to the writing of history (Commager 1976, 82). The progressives suggested alternatives to the traditional interpretations of history and they opened up arguments regarding previously agreed upon facts of history. "If pragmatism, as someone has said, provided American liberalism with its philosophical nerve, Progressive historiography gave it memory and myth and naturalized it within the whole framework of American historical experience" (Hofstadter 1968, xxii).

VARIATIONS ON A THEME

Progressive historians' influence in historiography was strongly felt by thew 1920s. Their interpretation soon became the dominant paradigm of American history in general and of journalism history in particular. This history began to be viewed as the struggle of editors, publishers, and reporters, who represented the side of freedom, liberty and democracy, in their crusade for liberal social and economic change (Startt and Sloan 1989, 29).

Progressive journalism historians consider history to be an evolutionary process whose goal is a better future. This view of history was also seen in the approaches of early journalism historians from the nationalist, romantic, and developmental schools. The nationalist school surfaced in the beginning of the nineteenth century and viewed journalists as important, influential, and patriotic individuals who contributed to America's struggle for freedom. The progress of freedom of the press was seen as an element of the development of liberty for the American people (Startt and Sloan 1989, 22-23).

The romantic school added personal reminiscences to the nationalist interpretation and emphasized the "great men" of history. The developmental school, which began in the second half of the nineteenth century, was based on the concept of professional development of the press and its progress towards professional journalistic practices and standards as it emphasized the careers and achievements of individual publishers and newspapers (Humphrey 1989, 248).

The consensus school developed in response to the progressive interpretation, and was most influential during the World War Two era. Rather than focus on elements of conflict, this approach emphasizes the common elements of unity and agreement that exist within American society. It justifies limits and controls that are placed on the media by adopting a belief that "absolute freedom of press and independence of media could result in an irresponsible journalism that could endanger the nation and the democratic system" (Startt and Sloan 1989, 29). In addition there is the cultural school of journalism history which considers the impact of media on society and the impact of society on the media. Carey suggests that prior to his call for cultural journalism history, none existed; however, other researchers trace cultural history back to the early twentieth century (Sloan 1989, 155, Humphrey 1989, 255 and Startt and Sloan 1989, 35-38). Although Carey and others consider progressive thought to be the dominant paradigm which journalism history, other researchers maintain that the underlying assumptions of the developmental school continue to be the most common perspective (Startt and Sloan 1989, 25 and Humphrey 1989, 249)

This paper maintains that there are no meaningful distinctions that can be made between any of these schools of thought. And that these approaches to journalism history, including Carey's concept of cultural history, are merely variations on a single theme which exist without substantial differences. As in Nina Baym's critique of the literature cannon and its critics, each variation offers a "consensus criticism of the consensus" and not much more (Baym 1989, 115). All of these approaches maintain an underlying belief in progress. They all exist within a liberal pluralist framework which assumes the existence of a free media system at work within a democratic society. None of these approaches considers the media to be vehicles of societal power which contribute to an inequality pervasive within America society. Questions of ideology, power, and domination are taboo subjects that are not addressed in these histories.

MARXIAN PERSPECTIVE

However, researchers who are willing to work outside the liberal pluralist framework may consider different interpretations and explanations that can help them to gain a greater understanding of society. Cultural historians may wish to consider questions of ideology "in which a system of meanings and values is the expression or projection of a particular class interest" (Williams 1988, 108). A history of "ordinary people" must be augmented by an examination of the elites who continue to shape the lives of individuals within society.

For example, Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony -- the domination of a ruling class through ideology through the shaping of popular consent can add valuable insights to journalism historiography. Hegemony is an active process which extends beyond culture in its "insistence on relating the 'whole social process' to specific distributions of power and influence" (Williams 1988,108). It unites the persuasion from above with the consent of those individuals below as it operates through "a complex web of social activities and institutional procedures. Hegemony is done by the dominant and collaborated in by the dominated." It enters all facets of daily life, it frames work, leisure time, and interpersonal relationships; it impacts creative energies, thoughts, beliefs, and desires. "In every sphere of social activity, it meshes with the 'common sense' through which people make the world seem intelligible; it tries to become that common sense" (Gitlin 1980, 10).

Stuart Hall suggests that hegemony depends on a combination of force and consent that is used by the dominant class as they coerce and actively organize to win the consent of the dominated. The dominant class are seen to construct favorable definitions of reality which become the "primary lived reality for the subordinate classes" (Hall 1977, 332) Hegemony is seen to deeply saturate the consciousness of society; it is not a single entity but is instead a highly complex combination of internal structures which continually must be renewed, recreated, and defended. These structures are continually challenged and can be somewhat modified (Williams 1973, 8-9).

For journalism history to be meaningful, researchers must consider the dominant practices, meanings, and values within society; historians must consider the lives of the powerful as well as the lives of the powerless, the meanings they make of their lives and the areas in which they interact. Journalism history must consider the current conditions of the press and the sources of media power and manipulation. A cultural history of journalism must be more than an examination of the imaginations of the participants in events, it must also be a history that "exposes the reigning ideology in society, raises questions about the exercise of freedom of the press and tests its validity as a cherished and celebrated principle of society under current economic and political conditions" (Hardt 1989a, 129). However, a cultural history must not forget the "radically unlike" minority interests, concepts, and activities which co-exist with the "dominant forms, through submerged by them or subdued" (Barzun 1973, 402). Each period in history has minority interests which must be addressed; it is necessary to consider how these dissident voices contribute to a culture. The minority interest's interaction with the dominant ideology and the outcome of this interaction should also be considered. Some minority interests become the dominant interests of future generations -- some do not; either way a representative cultural history must address these interests.

American journalism historians should consider the work of Raymond Williams, E.P. Thompson, Richard Hoggart, and others in the British Cultural Studies tradition and their use of humanistic values in determining the complicated interplay of social, political, and economic factors. These Marxist perspectives place a great emphasis on social and cultural processes, they consider culture to be a way of life, to be the entire "social process" in which individuals define and shape their lives (Williams 1988, 108). This view of culture does not stress a single theme but strives to incorporate all meaning into a complete way of life; it encourages the consideration of social, political, and economic conditions that exist in contemporary society. In addition, it serves to gain "an understanding of the press as a medium of societal communication in everyday life: as a social and political institution with its own educational or informational objectives and at the same time as a medium that defines, expresses, and reinforces a way of life" (Hardt 1989a, 127).

Rather than ignore class related problems (or pretending they do not exist) Marxist researchers identify and then confront issues of class struggle. Class is seen not as a structure, category, or thing; it is viewed instead as a historical phenomenon that occurs in human relationships, over periods of time, through which patterns develop in ideas, relationships, and institutions (Thompson 1966, 9-11). In addition, these researchers examine the way experiences are embodied in traditions, value systems, ideas, and institutional forms and they focus on the possibilities of change that exist within people.

Eugene Genovese's research on slavery in the United States is one example of how a Marxian perspective can guide American cultural historiography. Genovese adopts the Gramscian theory of hegemony in his consideration of the dependent relationship that existed between slaves and their masters. He analyzes conditions of slavery within a total sociocultural system which he sees as "enmeshing dominator and dominated alike, elaborating the life and outlook of slaves without pretending that they were the prime determinants of their own history" (Stearns 1982, 216).

CONCLUSION

Carey's concept of cultural history does not really offer a viable alternative to journalism history; it is instead a variation on a theme, a new twist to the reigning liberal pluralist ideology. What is needed is a fresh perspective of journalism history, an analysis that views history as a "continuous and connected process" (Williams 1983, 148) which takes into consideration the emotions, motivations, and expectations of individuals involved in historical events but also considers the framework imposed by political, social, and economic factors which influence all of society. Cultural history should evaluate all of the influences, pressures, and events that affect individuals, classes and nations.

> History as a record of human experience is a source for understanding the meaning and importance of social phenomena, including the role and function of the media in society. In addition to the view of the media as symbols of power and profit or as a measure of political and commercial interests and success, questions of human needs and the

> relationship between individuals and media as a potential source of societal reform are equally important aspects for comparative and international communication research (Hardt 1988, 142-3)

Utilizing a theoretical framework that gives meaning to the vast array of historical information, and considers questions of ideology, power and domination, it is possible to incorporate interpretations of journalism history that offer more than a one dimensional interpretation. Using the abolitionist press as but one example, a cultural history would consider the historical consciousness of the period, the imaginations of individuals connected with the abolitionist press, and the social, economic, and political conditions of the period. It would consider the individual ideals, goals, motivations of the abolitionist editors and publishers, both personally and as it related to their newspapers. A cultural history would explore the content and meanings of abolitionist papers to determine what the papers were like and to understand how they differed from the mainstream press. The interaction between the mainstream press and the abolitionist press would be considered along with the interaction between the abolitionist editors and publishers and dominant members of society. This type of examination would consider the strategies abolitionists used to fight the dominant ideology and the political, legal and extralegal pressures that were exerted upon these abolitionist editors and publishers. A cultural history would ask why these editors and publishers fought for the rights of slaves, and it would consider the impact of technological advances on the abolitionist press. The economic, social, and political pressures placed on the abolitionist press by members of the dominant class would also be explored. This type of cultural history would attempt to incorporate all of these concerns rather than focus on one individual factor.

REFERENCES

Barzun, Jacques. "Cultural History: A Synthesis." In The Varieties of History, From Voltaire to the Present ed. Fritz Stern,387-402, New York: Vintage Books, 1973.

Baym, Nina. "Melodramas of Beset Manhood." In The Critical Tradition, Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends ed. David H. Richter, 1,146-1,157, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.

Beard, Charles. An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935.

Braeman, John. "Charles A. Beard: Historian and Progressive." In Charles A. Beard ed. Marvin C. Swanson, 46-77, Greencastle, Indiana: DePauw University, 1976.

Brown, Robert E. Carl Becker on History and the American Revolution. East Lansing, Michigan: Spartan Press, 1970.

Carey, James W. "The Problem of Journalism History." Journalism History 1 no. 1 (Spring 1974): 3-5, 27.

________. "Mass Communication Research and Cultural Studies: An American View." In Mass Communication and Society, eds. James Curran, Michael Gurevitch, and Janet Woollacott, 409-425. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, Ltd., 1977.

________ ed. Media, Myths and Narratives, Television and the Press. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1988.

________. "Commentary: Communications and the Progressives." Critical Studies In Mass Communication 6 no. 3 (September 1989a): 264-282.

________. Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society. Winchester, Massachusetts: Unwin Hyman, Inc., 1989b.

Commager, Henry Steele. "Charles A. Beard: A Study in Paradox." In Charles A. Beard ed. Marvin C. Swanson, 78-98, Greencastle, Indiana: DePauw University, 1976.

Conze, Werner. "Social History." Translated by Charles A. Wright. Journal of Social History 1 no. 1 (1967-68): 7-16.

Cooley, Charles Horton. Human Nature and the Social Order. In The Two Major Works of Charles H. Cooley. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1956.

Covert, Cathy. "Some Thoughts on Research. Journalism History 1 no. 1 (1974): 32-33.

Darnton, Robert. The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History. New York: Basic Books 1984.

________. "Intellectual and Cultural History." In The Past Before Us. Contemporary and Historical Writing in the United States ed. Michael Kammen, 327-354, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1982.

________. The Kiss of Lamourette. Ontario, Canada: Penguin Books, 1990.

Duncum, Paul. "Approaches to Cultural Analysis." Journal of American Culture 10 no. 2 (Summer 1987): 1-15.

Eason, David, and Fred Fogo. "The Cultural Turn in Media Studies." Mass Communication Review 15 no. 1 (1987): 2-7.

Emery, Michael. "The Writing of American Journalism History." Journalism History 10 no 3-4 (Autumn/Winter 1983): 38-43.

Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basis Books, Inc., 1973.

Genovese, Eugene D. "Beard's Economic Interpretation of History." In Charles A. Beard ed. Marvin C. Swanson, 24-44, Greencastle, Indiana: DePauw University, 1976.

Gitlin, Todd. The Whole World is Watching. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

Hall, Stuart. "Culture, the Media and the 'Ideological Effect.'" In Mass Communication and Society eds. James Curran, Michael Gurevitch, and Janet Woollacott, 315-348, London: Edward Arnold Publishers, Ltd., 1977.

Hardt, Hanno. "Comparative Media Research: The World According to America." Critical Studies In Mass Communication 5 no. 2 (June 1988): 129-146.

________. "The Foreign-Language Press in American Press History." Journal of Communications 39 no. 2 (Spring 1989a): 114-131.

________. "Newsworkers, Technology and Media History: A Critical Review." For Conference on Culture and Communication. Temple University, Philadelphia (October 5-7, 1989b): 1-23.

Hays, Samuel P. "A Systematic Social History." In American History Retrospect and Prospect eds. George Athan Billias and Gerald N. Grob, 315-366. Free Press: New York, 1971.

Hecht. Jean J. "Social History." In International Encylopedia of the Social Sciences, Volume 6 ed. David L. Sills, 455-462, Macmillan Co., and the Free Press, 1968.

Heller, Scott. "Cultural Studies: Eclectic and Controversial Mix of Research Sparks a Growing Movement." Chronicle of Higher Education (January 1990): 4, 8.

Higham, John. "Charles A. Beard." In International Encylopedia of the Social Sciences, Volume 2 ed. David L. Sills, 33-37, Macmillan Co., and the Free Press, 1968.

Hobsbawm, E.J. "From Social History to the History of Society." Daedalus -- Historical Studies Today (Winter 1971): 20-43.

Hofstadter, Richard. The Progressive Historians. Turner. Beard. Parrington. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.

Humphrey, Carol Sue. "The Revolutionary Press: Source of Unity or Division? Press Historians Rewrite the Story of the American Revolution." American Journalism 6 no. 4 (Fall 1989): 245-256.

Marzolf, Marion. "Operationalizing Carey -- An Approach to the Cultural History of Journalism." Journalism History 2 no. 2 (Summer 1975): 42-43.

________. "American Studies -- Ideas for Media Historians." Journalism History 5 no. 1 (Spring 1978): 1, 13-16.

McKerns, Joseph P. "The Limits of Progressive Journalism History." Journalism History 4 no. 3 (Autumn 1977): 88-92.

Nord, David Paul. "A Plea for Journalism History." Journalism History 15 no. 1 (Spring 1988): 8-15.

Peters, John Durham. "Satan and Savior: Mass Communication in Progressive Thought." Critical Studies In Mass Communication 6 no. 3 (September 1989a): 247-263.

________. "Democracy and American Mass Communication Theory: Dewey, Lippmann, Lazarfeld." Communication 2, no. 3 (1989b): 199-220.

Reilly, Tom. "'Putting the World at Peril: 'A Conversation with James W. Carey." Journalism History 12 no. 2 (Summer 1985): 38-53.

Schwarzlose, Richard A. "First Things First: A Proposal." Journalism History 2 no. 2 (Summer 1975): 38-39, 63.

Sloan, Wm. David. "Historians and the American Press, 1900-1945; Working Profession or Big Business?" American Journalism 3 no. 3 (1986): 155-166.

Startt, James D., and Wm. David Sloan. Historical Methods in Mass Communication. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc., 1989.

Stearns, Peter N. "Toward a Wider Vision: Trends in Social History." In The Past Before Us, Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States ed. Michael Kammen, 205-230, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Stevens, John D., and Hazel Dicken Garcia. Communication History. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980.

Thompson, E.P. The Making of the English Working Class. New York: Vintage Books, 1966.

Ware, Caroline. The Cultural Approach to History. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

Ward, Jean. "Interdisciplinary Research and Journalism Historians." Journalism History 5 no. 1 (Spring 1978): 1, 13-16.

Westergaard, John. "Power, Class, and the Media." In Mass Communication and Society eds. James Curran, Michael Gurevitch, and Janet Woollacott, 95-115. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, Ltd., 1977.

Williams, Raymond. "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory." New Left Review 82 (Nov. - Dec. 1973): 3-16.

________. Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

________. Marxism and Literature. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

A Struggle Over Professionalism:
Jazz Age Journalism
And the Founding of the
American Society of Newspaper Editors

Submitted to AEJMC History Division
March 1990

Bruce J. Evensen
DePaul University
Department of Communication
Chicago, Illinois

"A Struggle Over Professionalism: Jazz Age Journalism and the Founding of the American Society of Newspaper Editors."

The January 1922 issue of the Atlantic Monthly contained an attack by its editor on American newspapers that was almost mild by contemporary standards. Frederick L. Allen, under the title "Newspapers and the Truth," quoted the leading critics of his day in lamenting the excesses of jazz age journalism. "What makes yellow journalism really dangerous," Allen charged, "is not so much its appetite for scandal as its continual distortion of the news in the interest of undiluted entertainment." He urged more conscientious publishers and editors to formulate "a code of newspaper ethics" to quarantine their profession from further contamination.[1]

This paper concerns the editor who read Allen's critique and took up his challenge, and in so doing, provoked a decade long debate among the "gentlemen of the press" on journalism professionalism and a code of ethics to preserve the dignity of that profession. The founding of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the subsequent imbroglio over the discipling of one of its members implicated in the Teapot Dome scandal, brought into sharp relief divisions among the nation's editors over the nature of their profession and its ability to impose standards of ethical conduct on its members. The controversy which enveloped the A.S.N.E. was a struggle over occupational respectability in an era in which that respectability seemed in particular dispute.

An analysis of the proceedings of the A.S.N.E. during the decade of he Twenties along with the growing literature on the evolution of "professionalism" within occupations, suggests the failure to censure F. G. Bonfils in the Teapot Dome affair reflected a lack of consensus among journalism's elite on the nature of the work they did. For some it was a profession, for others an art, for still others a trade or craft. This research examines these conflicting models during a time in which several leading occupations were struggling over similar questions of self-definition. The founding of the A.S.N.E. and its wrestling with an enforceable code of ethics were defining moments in the battle over professionalism during America's jazz age.

Casper Yost and the Founding of A.S.N.E.

Malcolm Bingay, editor of the Detroit Free Press, notes that Casper S. Yost, editorial page editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, first raised the idea of a national association of newspaper editors in 1912. Bingay remembers Yost's dream was "the creation of an ethical organization of American newspaper editors...banded together on the common ground of high purpose."[2] Yost's intent was already evident in his development of a "business code of ethics" which in March 1922 urged all businessmen to recognize their profession "is essentially founded upon integrity," thereby requiring publication of "a definite and known standard for business conduct" to which "businessmen who show little or no respect for ethical principles" would be held accountable.[3] A similar sentiment, expressed in his The Principles of Journalism published two years later, urged "all journalists to realize we are members of one body, having collective interests and collective purposes." The application of common standards of ethical practice would allow journalism to "take its place among the great professions."[4]

Yost had at first thought to respond to Allen's attack in the editorial pages of the Globe-Democrat but thought the time was right to discuss the larger problem of journalistic integrity with several of his colleagues. Yost, joined by Erie Hopwood of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, E.S. Beck of the Chicago Tribune, Charles H. Dennis of the Chicago Daily News and George E. Miller of the Detroit News met at Chicago's Blackstone Hotel in February 1922. Beck remembers that Yost's idea of a national association of newspaper editors seemed so sensible "it took hold at once."[5] A followup meeting at the American Newspaper Publishers Association convention in New York in April led to the adopting of a constitution and a determination that future membership in the A.S.N.E. should be restricted to newspaper editors serving populations of 100,000 or more.[6] Yost was named the organization's president. He wrote his wife that founding editors hoped the infant organization would grow to become "the greatest thing that was ever done for American journalism."[7]

Those hopes would be hampered by a constitution which reflected the deep ambivalence of the nation's elite editors to disciplining members who had "dishonored" the profession.[8] The constitution's preamble described the organization's purpose as promoting "acquaintance among its members" for the purpose of maintaining "the dignity and rights of the profession" by "considering and perhaps (emphasis added) establishing ethical standards of professional conduct." The constitution affirms the complete independence of its members "in editorial action," while stating it is not the purpose of the society to "punish" those who labor in the profession.[9]

At A.S.N.E.'s first annual meeting on April 27-28, 1923 in Washington, D.C., Yost told the fifty-seven editors present that "the society has no more important purpose" than "establishing ethical standards of professional conduct." Yost explained that "the ethics of journalism must somehow be expressed in definite form" and be "established as the rule of practice of an influential number of journalists...by which all journalistic conduct may be measured."[10] Dennis agreed. "The newspaper profession...has been almost voiceless," he claimed, and therefore "has been subjected to terrific broadsides of half truths." The society's task, as he saw it, was "the working out of such standards of service" which would allow American newspapers to approximate "the best ideals of the profession."[11]

Those ideals were expressed in a code of ethics, or canons of journalism, prepared by Henry J. Wright of the New York Globe, and adopted with only minor changes at A.S.N.E.'s first annual meeting. The code's call for "truthfulness, impartiality, fair play and decency," by its own admission "lacked the authority of enforcement."[12] Wright hoped the code might lead both journalists and the American public to take American journalism more seriously.[13] His effort to establish a Grievance Committee to interpret the code and give it "teeth" was rejected after the liveliest debate of the convention. James Williams of the Boston Transcript feared the organization "was biting off more than we can chew."[14] David Smiley of the Philadelphia Public Ledger warned a binding code of ethics "was laying the foundation for trouble and a split in this organization." Smiley did not believe A.S.N.E. could "set itself up in anything approaching the board of censors of the Bar Association."[15] Herbert B. Swope of the New York World feared "we have indulged in a beautiful gesture that is perfectly meaningless."[16] The man who would later lead the fight to strengthen the code, Willis J. Abbot of the Christian Science Monitor, warned the society would make itself a national laughingstock if it adjourned after passing "a lot of meaningless resolutions" which did not materially advance the cause of journalistic professionalism.[17]

Passage of the Code of Ethics was warmly greeted, if not completely understood, by critics of jazz age journalism. The New York Times published the canons in their entirety and gave front page play to President Warren Harding's assurance that "there never was a time when a fitting code of ethics was so essential to the press of America."[18] Henry Luce's newly born Time magazine completely misrepresented the matter in claiming, "The American Society of Newspaper Editors aims to be to journalism what the American Bar Association is to the legal fraternity."[19] Marvin H. Creager of the Milwaukee Journal came nearer the truth many years later when he observed, "There were recruits who were all for putting on a star and grabbing a club and running the grafters and rowdies out of newspaperdom. To many it looked like a good idea. Others doubted that it would work."[20]

The founding of A.S.N.E., the character of its constitution, and the controversy over its Code of Ethics reflect the difficulties journalists had in establishing their occupation as a profession which could command the standing often enjoyed by doctors, lawyers and clergymen. It was not, as Beck observed in a letter to Arthur Krock, then of the New York World, that journalists were mere "employes" unable to operate independently of editorial or business practices with which they might disagree.[21] A more fundamental problem was that journalists prized that independence and were chary of any organizational association which might cause them to surrender it.[22] Herbert Bayard Swope of the New York World was a leader in favoring a code of ethics "to preserve the integrity of journalism as a whole" but he was equally concerned that "unless we be cautious" the ethical code "will be played against ourselves" and "we will be hoist by our own petard."[23] The gentlemen of the press had "a hunger to be respectable" during the jazz age but a competing appetite to be free in going about their business.[24]

Journalism and Professionalism

Jazz age journalists saw theirs as a "restless" period in which the underlying values of their culture were being contested with an intensity unknown to previous generations.[25] Within this social setting, several leading occupations formed associations and developed codes of ethics. Personnel managers had organized in 1916, industrial administrators in 1920.[26] Codes of ethics were adopted or proposed for the nation's judges and engineers in 1922 and its businessmen in 1925.[27] The professionalization of social workers had attracted the attention of sociologists in 1915.[28] A definition of professionalization was developed in 1928, when A.M. Carr-Saunders noted that professions were occupations which were based upon specialized intellectual study and training, the purpose of which was to supply skilled service to others for a definite fee or salary.[29]

There has been considerable development in the understanding of professionalism since Carr-Saunders pioneering study, it beginning with his assertion in 1933 that several threshholds needed to be reached before occupations could be considered fully professionalized. In addition to prolonged and specialized training and service to the community he added "a concern for the competence and honor of those who practice the profession" and the development of a professional association "which would enforce standards of conduct" among its members.[30] Carr-Saunders found newspaper work a product of collaborative crafts which bore so little relationship to a profession that it "hardly came into the picture."[31]

Leaders in journalism education had long been urging the nation's editors and publishers to take their work seriously by establishing an enforceable code of ethics to encourage professional practice. Willard Grosvenor Bleyer, soon to become head of the University of Wisconsin's infant journalism program, urged journalists in 1913 to follow the example of doctors and lawyers in "regulating the conditions of admission to practice" and maintenance of a "code of ethics" as part of journalism's "responsibility to the community."[32] That had also been the call of James Melvin Lee at New York University, Dean Walter Williams at Missouri, Allen Sinclair Will at Rutgers and Leon Nelson Flint of the University of Kansas.[33] Flint noted that if journalists failed to hold colleagues accountable to a professional standard the public would do it for them. Until journalists created "machinery for the enforcement of standards," Flint wrote, "journalism would be a profession in nature and spirit but not form."[34]

Academics saw business interests behind journalism's failure to win the respect or status of a profession. Ernest Gruening, writing in the September 1924 issue of Century under the title "Can Journalism Be a Profession?" decried "the ownership of newspapers by men who are in no sense journalists, but rather who view their property precisely as they would a factory or a department store."[35] The contention was extended by a veteran newspaper man who wrote in the June 1925 issue of Harper's Magazine that "never were newspapermen as a class so lacking in purpose or so contemptuous of their profession, morally and intellectually, as they are today" when "building circulation was the substitute for editorial leadership."[36] In a famous textbook of the period, Kansas State's Nelson A. Crawford claimed that journalism would never become a profession so long as "those who come into it, turn to it as they would a dry goods business, failing to understand its history."[37]

During the jazz age, academics were heartened both by the growth of journalism schools and the development of codes of ethics by state press and editorial associations. The first School of Journalism had matriculated its first class in 1909. By June of 1926, The Journalism Bulletin was reporting the 50 top schools offering journalism courses had 5,532 students taking those courses.[38] When the Council on Education for Journalism, made up of leading journalism educators, established in 1925 standards for the teaching of journalism, Crawford thought journalism was well on its way in establishing itself as a profession comparable to law and medicine.[39] Southern Methodist University's Albert Henning thought the standardization of journalism education would quickly lead to "qualifying tests for journalists" and instruments to expel journalists for "disobedience to ethical codes of conduct."[40]

The first state press association to adopt a code of ethics was Kansas in 1910. It urged members to do nothing "which offended the sensibility of the most enlightened people" and to take seriously their "public trust." Similar sounding codes, emphasizing the press' public responsibility, were passed in Missouri in 1921, Oregon and South Dakota in 1922, and Washington state in 1923. Individual newspapers which had previously had no published code of ethics published rules of professional conduct. These included the Brooklyn Eagle, the Christian Science Monitor, the Springfield Republican, the Springfield Union, the Detroit News, the Sacramento Bee, the Seattle Times, the Kansas City Journal-Post and the Hearst newspapers. Dean Williams even developed a "Journalist's Creed" that was widely circulated.[41]

The difficulty of such codes for advocates of journalism's professionalization was that individual newspaper practice often led to their being overlooked. Thomas A. Lackey of Notre Dame's commerce faculty noted this was a natural consequence of the growing importance of advertising. Since two-thirds of all newspaper revenue now came from advertising, he reasoned, the publisher's first duty was increasingly not to his readers but the delivery of large circulations to advertisers.[42] Silas Bent has observed that this reality made elite papers as interested in "romance, sex and crime" as the tabloids they despised.[43] Lee A. White, an editor with the Detroit News, spoke for a lot of his fellow editors when he complained "the greatest single weakness of the press" is "our subservience to a largely imaginary public."[44] The New Republic noted, "One touch of murder makes the whole press Hearst."[45]

Advocates of professionalization within journalism urged A.S.N.E. to lead the fight by adopting tough ethical standards which would be enforceable upon members. Gruening noted the irony that when A.S.N.E. members gathered for their second annual meeting in Atlantic City on April 25 of 1924, the man who had drafted the Canons of Journalism, H.J. Wright of the New York Globe, was no longer eligible to serve in the organization. His Globe along with four other New York dailies had disappeared during the year. As long as membership in the A.S.N.E. was determined not by the man but the job, and as long as those jobs were controlled by publishers whose first concern was profit, Greuning wondered what chance there was the nation's elite editors would ever take the high ground on ethics.[46] They would have their chance in Atlantic City when one of their members became embroiled in the scandal that shook the Harding administration, the Teapot Dome affair.

F.G. Bonfils and the Teapot Dome

Two months before the A.S.N.E. met, Fred G. Bonfils, the co-owner of the Denver Post, testified before Congressional investigators that oilman Harry F. Sinclair had given him $250,000 as partial payment for an alleged prior claim to oil reserve lands, known as the Teapot Dome in Wyoming. Committee members charged Bonfils had received hush money to stop publishing articles critical of Sinclair's purchase of the property and with impeding an investigation of the deal by the Albuquerque Morning Journal.[47]

Bonfils involvement in the budding scandal which had implicated Albert B. Fall, the secretary of the interior, and John C. Shaffer, publisher of the Rocky Mountain News, provoked widespread condemnation in the press. Typical was the editorial attitude of Editor and Publisher, which charged flatly that Bonfils' "greed" had "humiliated" the press and "lessened public faith" in it.[48] Editor and Publisher cited portions of A.S.N.E.'s canons of journalism in observing that "the little, cynical minority who prey on newspapers...to compensate for their own inferiority and journalistic incompetence" would not be allowed to stand.[49]

The nation's news editors publicly congratulated themselves on agreeing at A.S.N.E.'s spring convention to investigate members of the orgnization charged with violating the Canons of Journalism. Editor and Publisher maintained that the action demonstrated that the canons "have taken a bulldog grip on the minds of editors" and that there was "no doubt that notice had been served on the 'Typhoid Marys of Journalism,' that editors meant business."[50] But a reading of the convention's proceedings reveals that the division expressed the year before over the code had only deepened with time.

James Williams of the Boston Transcript, who the year before had opposed giving the canon enforcement powers, found himself the chairman of the Committee on Ethical Standards, a sign that others within the society shared his concern. Williams spoke for them when he urged caution in the Bonfils case. "Plutarch having told us that character is long standing habit," Williams told members, "the best contribution this society can make toward the advancement of the code (was) to promote code obedience rather than code enforcement. Arthur Vandenberg, editor of the Grand Rapids Herald and soon to become a United States senator, objected. Vandenberg did not see how it was possible to adjourn the meeting "without telling the country that we mean what we say when we talk about ethics." Otherwise, Vandenberg stated, "a pretense of ethics" would be seen by the public as "a mere gesture."[51]

Some within the society sided with President Yost, who was concerned the organization was about to set a dangerous precedent. Williams charged he had no intention of serving in a society that made itself "a smelling committee for the American press." Other members agreed, arguing it was pointless to further "humiliate" a fellow editor who had already been forced to "bite the dust." But Vandenberg's position was sustained by a majority of A.S.N.E. members who finally sided with Walter Harrison of the Oklahoma City Oklahoman who observed no harm would be done by allowing the society's board of directors to investigate a matter involving issues "as old as eternity."[52]

When the nation's editors reconvened at the New Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C. on January 16, 1925, Bonfils' name still appeared on their society's membership roster. A special meeting of the board of directors held the day before the convention decided to prevent the matter from coming to the floor.[53] Bonfils would be given "a reasonable time to prepare a defense" before coming before the board, but Yost reiterated to A.S.N.E.'s membership his conviction the board "did not possess power like the bar associations of the country to throw out our own members who transgress the ethics of the calling. We may disapprove of them and say so publicly but that is where our power stops."[54]

Yost's attitude, initially, did not carry a majority of A.S.N.E.'s board members with him. Bonfils, accompanied by an attorney, appeared before the board on October 13, 1925 in Chicago. Transcripts of the entire afternoon's discussion, while not appearing in the board's minutes, were sent to each of the board members not present.[55] When A.S.N.E.'s full membership met in January 1926, a final decision on Bonfils was but a few weeks away. Yost, as outgoing president, perhaps sensing the attitude of the majority on A.S.N.E.'s 12 man board, made his strongest statement yet about the enforcement power of the canon. "There are some among us who insist that we must have a code with teeth in it," he told A.S.N.E. members. "But what sort of teeth, how is it to bite and who is it to bite? I am unable to see any valid distinction between censorship of the press by this society and censorship of the press by any other society, political or otherwise."[56]

On February 9, 1926, A.S.N.E.'s board of directors meeting in Cleveland, took the step Yost had opposed, and ordered that Bonfils "be censured and expelled from membership in the society" for conduct "conducive to the weakening or destruction of public confidence in the newspaper press." A copy of the board's decision was sent to Bonfils by registered mail in the understanding that no one on the board would leak its decision to the press.[57] The members held their public counsel, but Erie Hopwood, the Cleveland Plain Dealer editor who succeeded Yost as A.S.N.E. president, privately told his city editor, Nathaniel Howard, what happened next. Bonfils apparently "threatened to sue the society and each director for slander" and then privately struck a deal that if the society would drop the matter he would resign his membership in A.S.N.E. This satisfied a majority on the board, who on the advice of counsel, decided in October 1926 to rescind its February action and drop the matter entirely. But this hardly satisfied those who were demanding a tough ethics code. Led by the Christian Science Monitor's Willis Abbot and the New York Times' Arthur Krock, they determined to make a convention floor fight of it to reverse the board's "milksop performance."[58]

A last minute compromise headed off a showdown for one more year. Hopwood, citing the need to revise the constitution to put some "teeth" in it, named a committee composed of Yost, Dennis and Creager to do just that.[59] The committee came back with not one proposed revision, but two. The first proposal called for amending the constitution so that the board could proceed against members charged with unprofessional conduct. The second proposal, favored by a majority of committee members, would deprive the board of any power to consider such charges.[60]

The committee proposals provoked one of the stormiest sessions in A.S.N.E. history, producing a great debate which demonstrates the deep divisions over professionalism during the period of jazz age journalism.

Those opposing the policing power of the society again turned to Yost as their prime spokesman. At the society's April 1928 convention Yost told members "nothing is to be gained for the society or for journalism by the prosecution of members for unprofessional conduct. Ours is an institutional and not an individual profession." Since the society could not put newspapers on trial, Yost did not see how it was possible to punish an individual for what his newspaper might have done. "This is a society not of newspapers, "he reminded members, "but a society of men."[61]

Abbot led those favoring an enforcement mechanism for the code of ethics. Abbot thought it "intolerable" and "indefensible" that the nation's leading editors should not be able to punish members for "professionally unethical conduct." Paul Williams of the Utica Press wondered how journalism could be considered a "profession" unless it had the courage to act. Tom Wallace of the Louisville Times was convinced the society was at a "crisis." If it failed to act it might just as well "disband our committee on ethics and repeal our Canons of Journalism."[62]

Opponents of Abbot's initiative resented his claim that they did not take professionalism seriously. "Just what is unprofessionalism?" the Cleveland Plain Dealer's Paul Bellamy asked Abbot. The society's purpose, Bellamy argued, was not to strip a man "of the most valuable possession he has, namely, his reputation." Fellow board member Fred Fuller Shedd of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin concurred. To claim that someone was unfit for the journalistic profession, Shedd argued, would be to commit libel against him.

Charges of unprofessional conduct, Creager insisted, were a matter of opinion not proof.[63]

Just as had been the case two years before, when the Abbot faction appeared to have prevailed in Bonfils' ouster, the 1928 convention appeared to endorse a change in the A.S.N.E. constitution to allow the policing of the code of ethics. Abbot's controversial amendment passed 16 to 15 and legal counsel was directed to change A.S.N.E.'s constitution accordingly. Later, however, it was ruled Abbot's amendment required a two-thirds majority. Final action by the A.S.N.E. membership on the enforcement provisions of its code of ethics was put off until the following year.[64]

The jazz age was ending when A.S.N.E. delegates reconvened in April 1929 to reconsider their ethics code. That year's president, Walter Harrison, said he was certain that after years of historic debate, the society was "about to take a momentous step" in adopting a means "of expelling those who disgrace themselves or their profession through unethical acts." But Abbot's amendment, which had been drafted by American Bar Association President John W. Davis, lost by a vote of 21 for and 34 against. The tone of the meeting was captured by Samuel M. Williams, editor-in-chief of the St. Paul Pioneer Dispatch, who received vigorous applause when he said, "I am against censorship in all of its forms, whether that censorship be imposed from without or constituted from within."[65]

The drive for an enforceable ethics code within A.S.N.E. did not end in 1929. Abbot's amendment carried a majority of the A.S.N.E. membership in 1930, but fell far short of the two-thirds majority he needed. The stalemate continued at the organization's 1931 convention.

Finally, in 1932, all sides were prepared to settle the dispute with a final compromise. Fully ten years after the question had first been raised, A.S.N.E. members agreed, this time unanimously, that its board of directors did have the power to suspend or expel members "for due cause." Yost considered the compromise broad enough to earn his support. Shedd, that year's president, thought the result "meant more for the welfare, the growth and development of the society, and its general influence and power in the newspaper profession, than anything we could have done."[66]

On October 23, 1975, A.S.N.E.'s board of directors, after several years of discussion, adopted a Statement of Principles, supplanting its 1922 Code of Ethics. In the 43 years which had followed Abbot's 1932 amendment to Article VIII of A.S.N.E.'s constitution, the enforcement powers of the society in matters of ethical violations had never been employed. The preamble of A.S.N.E.'s 1975 Statement of Principles simply encouraged its members to the highest possible standards of "ethical and professional performance."[67] Yost's argument that A.S.N.E. should be a voice of "moral suasion" and not "morals enforcer" had finally won out.

Journalism as Art, Business and Profession

The year after A.S.N.E. adopted its Statement of Principles perhaps the largest sociological study ever made of American journalists concluded their occupation had passed through the five historical stages typically leading to the winning of professional status for other occupational groups. The study found that for 140 years journalism had been a full-time occupation for some. For 70 years journalism had had training schools. Its first professional organization had been formed 90 years before and with the creation of the A.S.N.E. professional associations in journalism had expanded to include the occupation's best known editors. The study recognized how the journalistic community had been aggressive in its agitation for autonomy within its sphere of activity. Finally, the study observed that one of journalism's professional associations had promulgated a formal code of ethics.[68]

This research has suggested that A.S.N.E.'s Canons of Journalism was the self-conscious effort by several elite editors to enhance the status of their work, eventually winning for it recognition as a "profession." This effort failed for a variety of reasons both related and unrelated to the decade-long controversy over the canons. That controversy underscored the ambivalence of the nation's leading editors to their work, an ambivalence that has persisted since the passing ofjazz age journalism.

While some journalists have simply assumed the professional status of their occupation, others have shunned such pretensions.[69] William P. Beazell, the veteran assistant managing editor of the New York World, told A.S.N.E. members at their 1929 convention, "Newspaper work is not a profession. It cannot be a profession. I happen to be one of those who regard newspaper work as one of the arts. We take things. We mold things...just as the painter or the sculptor does."[70] That paralleled the attitude of columnists Joseph and Stewart Alsop who wrote a generation later that "newspaper reporting is not a profession, despite the complacent contrary belief of a good many reporters who have achieved the upper brackets. Newspaper reporting is a craft or trade, like undertaking, which it sometimes resembles."[71]

The men who first formed the A.S.N.E. were former reporters who had achieved the upper brackets. Yost's letters home at the time of the organiation's founding indicates that his real mission was to do something for journalism.[72] Beck sensed that that was the prevailing sentiment of each of the organization's five founding fathers.[73] Hopwood, who died at the height of the controversy over the canons, thought the society could claim credit for the increasing professionalism of the press.[74] The nation's 81 million newspaper readers who annually read 18 billion papers, Editor and Publisher claimed, could thank the country's conscientious editors for "giving newspaper work the professional status it deserves."[75]

Sociologists of work have pointed out that while many occupations have sought to elevate their status by calling themselves a "profession," few have succeeded. A major reason for the failure, according to Everett Hughes, is that the public resists the description and contests the rights and privileges that would flow from it.[76] Theodore Caplow described this as the means by which professions like medicine and law had obtained popular consent for their claims of expertise.[77] Eliot Freidson has pointed out that this consent is not easily won, for in granting it the public is acknowledging that the professial "is the most reliable authority on the nature of the reality he deals with."[78] Paul Starr has noted that historically the public submits to a profession's power of interpretation only when it is persuaded the profession's members share a "superior competency" in the domain within which they claim authority.[79]

A generation after A.S.N.E. began its great debate over a self-governing code of conduct, Curtis A. MacDougall observed that public opinion remained unconvinced American newspaper journalism was a profession, instead considering it a business.[80] The problem was not only that journalism appeared to lack a solid core of transmissible knowledge, but it had failed to persuade the public that business interests did not outweigh public service.[81] This was a point not lost on the nation's editors who preached the gospel of public service, while privately bemoaning that the sins of "personal journalism" were now being replaced by the sins of the "newspaper business."[82] As Paul Bellamy colorfully put it, he could think of no "journalistic dispensation as lurid as the tabloid" and no reading public "which cared less for the important concerns of society" nor wished as much to be "entertained."[83]

The effort to launch a national organization to protect the dignity of the elite press and to enhance the status of the "profession" of journalism failed in its mission to establish that status through a set of self-contradictions. No one organization could presume to speak for the journalistic profession as the American Medical Association and the American Bar Association spoke for the nation's doctors and lawyers. The A.S.N.E. constitution even excluded those editors whose papers or personal reputations were not large enough to merit membership. In the final analysis, however, it was not the hired hand who spoke most forcibly for his enterprise but the man who did the hiring. When asked his definition of a newspaper, Chicago Tribune publisher Col. Robert McCormick replied "a daily publication conducted for profit."[84] William Randolph Hearst saw circulation as the true "test of merit" for any newspaper because it served to measure how well it "pleased the public."[85] Journalism has become "a big business," Roy W. Howard, the editorial director of the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain, told A.S.N.E.'s members. "Organization and management 'does its stuff' in the sanctums where genius formerly functioned, and the results are better."[86]

There were those within A.S.N.E. who opposed the tendencies of their industry and what they saw as the withering of journalism's responsibility to its audience during the jazz age. The editor and publisher of the Harrisburg Telegraph, E.J. Stackpole, after 50 years in the busness, knew there was such a thing as "ethics" in newspaper work, but it was an ethics generally "established in the business office" and tied to "box office receipts."[87] Malcolm Bingay of the Detroit News "did not know what future scholars will call this age" but he thought it would be the era of "sensational headlines" and pictures which proved "legs made circulation."[88] The Cincinnati Times-Star's Moses Straus noted on matters of ethics that a certain cynacism ruled. He told his colleagues, "We know that whether a newspaper is ethical or un-ethical or non-ethical, it is still quite successful." That was why "the question of newspaper ethics doesn't seem to touch our emotions." Journalists, he told fellow delegates, "have not grown in self-consciousness as professional men." As a consequence, "the profession of journalism was based on (no) clear idea of what journalism is."[89]

Journalism's fundamental contradiction---that it is both commodity and public servant---was behind the dilemma facing the founders of A.S.N.E. during journalism's jazz age. The irony was understood by Casper Yost, whose circulation battles with the Pulitzers in St. Louis, made him well aware that newspapers must "aim at public service" even as they responded to a fickle public's "need for news."[90] Yost noted that his generation "gloried in its progress and its strength" but in the absence of any wisdom greater than its fathers.[91]

#############

Footnotes

1. Frederick L. Allen, "Newspapers and the Truth," *Atlantic Monthly*, January 1922, pp. 44-54.

2. "A Dream Come True," an article by Malcolm W. Bingay, appearing in the April 23, 1946 *Detroit Free Press*, p. 4. My thanks to Casper Yost's grandson, Robert W. Yost, Jr., for bringing my attention to the article.

3. Yost's work with the "Council Table," composed of St. Louis area educators, statesmen, writers, business and professional men, including his development of a "Business Code of Ethics" is described in his obituary which appears in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, May 31, 1941, pp. 1-2.

4. Casper S. Yost, *The Principles of Journalism* (New York: D. Appleton, 1924), preface and pp. 152-156.

5. Yost's recollections of his motivation for starting the A.S.N.E. are described in that organization's 1932 proceedings and are summarized by Alice Fox Pitts, *Read All About It!---Fifty Years of the American Society of Newspaper Editors* (Washington, D.C.: American Society of Newspaper Editors, 1974), p. 3. This is generally consistent with Yost's remarks before the first meeting of the A.S.N.E. membership. See *Problems of Journalism*, Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D.C., April 27-April 28, 1923, pp. 14-21.

For Beck's recollection of the reasons behind A.S.N.E.'s founding see his article, "A.S.N.E. Remains Enduring Memorial to St. Louis Editor," appearing on p. 3 of *The Bulletin* of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, June 4, 1941.

6. Minutes of the American Society of Newspaper Editors organizational meeting, dated April 25, 1922, at p. 1. American Society of Newspaper Editors archives. Newspaper Center. Reston, Virginia.

7. Letter from Casper Yost to Anna Yost, dated April 25, 1922. My thanks to Robert W. Yost for a copy of this letter.

8. A.S.N.E.'s constitution was modified at its organizational and mid year meeting on October 10, 1922 to include editors who had attained "distinctive rank" in metropolitan dailies within population centers under 100,000. See A.S.N.E. Minutes, April 25, 1922 meeting, p. 2 and A.S.N.E. Minutes, October 10, 1922 meeting, pp. 6-7.

9. Constitution for the American Society of Newspaper Editors, originally adopted in New York City, April 25, 1922 and provided to author by Lee Stinnett, executive director of A.S.N.E., Reston, Virginia. The constitution was developed by a committee under the guidance of American Bar Association President John W. Davis.

10. Problems of Journalism, A.S.N.E.'s first annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1923, pp. 18-19.

11. Ibid., pp. 21-22.

12. A.S.N.E. Minutes, April 28, 1923 meeting, pp. 13-14.

13. Problems of Journalism, A.S.N.E.'s first annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1923, p. 40.

14. Ibid., p. 123.

15. Ibid., p. 122.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid., p. 124.

18. New York Times, April 28, 1923, p. 8 and April 29, 1923, pp. 1-2.

19. Time, May 5, 1923, p. 23.

20. Pitts, p. 6.

21. The letter from Beck to Krock, undated, is cited in Pitts, p. 7.

22. For a discussion of news values among jazz age journalists and independence as an occupational attribute, see John W.C. Johnstone, Edward J. Slawski and William W. Bowman, The News People: A Sociological Portrait of American Journalists and Their Work (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1976), pp. 101-111. Michael Kirkhorn, "This Curious Existence: Journalistic Identity in the Interwar Period," in Catherine L. Covert and John D. Stevens, eds., Mass Media Between the Wars: Perspectives of Cultural Tension, 1918-1941 (Syracuse: Syracuse University, 1984), pp. 127-139.

See also, Leon N. Flint, The Conscience of a Newspaper: A Case Book in the Principles and Problems of Journalism (New York: D. Appleton, 1925), pp. 292-299. Charles R. Corbin, Why News Is News (New York: Ronald Press, 1928), pp. 3 and 103. Albert F. Henning, Ethics and Practices in Journalism (New York: Raymond Long and Richard R. Smith, 1932), pp. 58-59. Silas Bent, Ballyhoo: The Voice of the Press (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1927), pp. 150-151. Melvin E. Stone, Fifty Years a Journalist (Garden City: Doubleday, 1921), p. 371. Jonathan Daniels, They Will Be Heard: America's Crusading Newspaper Editors (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), p. 309.

23. Problems of Journalism, A.S.N.E.'s first annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1923, pp. 129-131.

24. Daniels, pp. 310-311. Penn Kimball, "Journalism: Art, Craft or Profession?" in Kenneth S. Lynn, ed., The Professions in America (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), pp. 242-260.

See also, Nelson A. Crawford, The Ethics of Journalism (New York: Knopf, 1924), pp. 25-38. Willard G. Bleyer, Journalism (Chicago: American Library Association, 1929), p. 20. R. T. Porte, The New Publisher: A Tale of Twelve Cities (Salt Lake City: Porte Publishing, 1924), iv. Oliver Knight, ed., I Protest: Selected Disquisitions of E.W. Scripps (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1966), pp. 185-192. Robert W. Desmond, Conflict and Crisis: World News Reporting Between Two Wars, 1920-1940 (Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1982), pp. 225-250.

25. Bent, p. 41. See also, Burgess Johnson, ed., Earning a Living By the Pen: Vocational Opportunities in Journalism for Young Women (New York: Vassar College, 1926), p. 15. Yost, p. 127. Flint, pp. 258-259. Henning, pp. 127-128.

26. Meyer Bloomfield, "The Aim and Work of Employment Managers' Associations," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 65, May 1916, pp. 76-78. Edward Meigh, "The Implications of Membership of a Professional Body," The British Management Review, 12, No. 3, 1952, pp. 126 and 133-140.

27. E.A. Harriman, "The Need for Standards of Ethics for Judges," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 101, May 1922, pp. 30-32. Frederick H. Newell, "Ethics of the Engineering Profession," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 101, May 1922, pp. 76-82. Louis D. Brandeis, Business---A Profession (Boston: Small, Maynard, 1925), pp. 4-5.

28. Abraham Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession?" School and Society, 1, 1915, pp. 901-911.

29. A.M. Carr-Saunders, Professions: Their Organization and Place in Society (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928), pp. 3-31.

30. A.M. Carr-Saunders and P.A. Wilson, The Professions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), p. 284.

31. Ibid., pp. 266-270 and 285.

32. Willard G. Bleyer, Newspaper Writing and Editing (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913), pp. 357-358.

33. See Albert A. Sutton, Education for Journalism in the United States from its Beginning to 1940 (Evanston: Northwestern University, 1945), pp. 1-4. Sarah Lockwood Williams, Twenty Years of Education for Journalism (Columbia: E.W. Stephens Publishing, 1929). Allen S. Will, Education for Newspaper Life (Newark: Essex Press, 1931). Also, Flint, pp. 258-259.

34. Flint, pp. 281-282.

35. Ernest Greuning, "Can Journalism Be a Profession? A Study of Conflicting Tendencies," The Century Magazine, September 1924, p. 697.

36. "Sell the Papers! The Malady of American Journalism," by an anonymous newspaper man, in Harper's Magazine, June 1925, pp. 1-9. The quote is on p. 5.

37. Crawford, p. 25.

38. The Journalism Bulletin, Vol. 3, No. 2, June 1926, p. 21 and Vol. 3, No. 3, November 1926, pp. 3-4 and 13.

39. Nelson A. Crawford, "Schools of Journalism Today," American Mercury, 6, 1925, pp. 197-200.

40. Henning, pp. 53-55.

41. Crawford, pp. 186-239. Flint, p. 132. For an example of a state newspaper code see Frank O. Eagin, ed., Oklahoma Newspaper Code (Oklahoma City: Harlow Publishing, 1928), particularly Sec. 75 of that code, on p. 94 dealing with criminal misdemeanor.

42. Thomas A. Lakey, The Morals of Newspaper Making (Notre Dame: University Press, 1924), pp. 29-32.

43. Bent, xv-xvi, 150 and 245. See also, Karl A. Bickel, New Empires: The Newspaper and the Radio (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1930), p. 19.

44. Flint, p. 127.

45. New Republic, April 11, 1923, pp. 175-176.

46. Greuning, pp. 693-694. See also, Max Eastman, Journalism Vs. Art (New York: Knopf, 1916), pp. 67-73 and 89. Eastman claimed newspapers had been overrun by a "business motive" which was "to please as many readers as possible and to offend no one." (p. 69.) Lakey, pp. 70-73. Andrew R. Sherrill, Newspapers and the Courts (Chicago: Hawkins and Loomis, 1924), pp. 5-11. Charles T. Sprading, Ruled by the Press (Los Angeles: George Rissman Publishing, 1917), pp. 2-11.

47. New York Times, February 9, 1924, pp. 1-2 and February 10, 1924, p. 1.

48. Editor and Publisher, February 16, 1924, p. 36.

49. Editor and Publisher, February 23, 1924, p. 44.

50. Editor and Publisher, May 3, 1924, p. 26.

51. Problems of Journalism, A.S.N.E.'s second annual meeting, Atlantic City, N.J., 1924, pp. 68-69.

52. Ibid., pp. 72-77. See also, A.S.N.E. minutes, April 25, 1924 meeting, p. 23.

53. A.S.N.E. minutes, October 14, 1924 mid-year meeting of board of directors at Blackstone Hotel in Chicago, p. 26. Also, A.S.N.E. minutes of special meeting of board of directors, January 15, 1924 at New Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., p. 27.

54. Editor and Publisher, January 24, 1925, p. 5. Problems of Journalism, A.S.N.E.'s third annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1925, p. 42.

55. A.S.N.E. minutes, October 13, 1925 mid-year meeting of board of directors held in Chicago, p. 31.

56. Problems of Journalism, A.S.N.E.'s fourth annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1926, p. 23.

57. A.S.N.E. minutes, February 9, 1926 organizational meeting of board of directors held in Cleveland, pp. 34-36.

58. A.S.N.E. minutes, October 5, 1926 mid-year meeting of board of directors held in Chicago, pp. 37-38. Also, A.S.N.E. minutes, January 13, 1927 meeting of board of directors held in Washington, D.C., p. 39. Also, Pitts, pp. 31-32.

59. Problems of Journalism, A.S.N.E.'s fifth annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1927, pp. 190-193.

60. Problems of Journalism, A.S.N.E.'s sixth annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1928, p. 84.

61. Ibid., p. 87.

62. Ibid., pp. 89-91.

63. Ibid., pp. 98-99.

64. Ibid., pp. 166-168.

65. Problems of Journalism, A.S.N.E.'s seventh annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1929, pp. 21 and 157.

66. Pitts, pp. 35-36.

67. John L. Hulteng, Playing It Straight: A Practical Discussion of the Ethical Principles of the American Society of Newspaper Editors (Chester, Conn.: The Globe Pequot Press, 1981), p. 85.

68. Johnstone, et al., pp. 98 and 111.

69. Kimball, p. 243. Douglas Cater, The Fourth Branch of Government (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959), preface. John Hohenberg, The News Media: A Journalist Looks at His Profession (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston), pp. 3-16. James B. Reston, "The Job of the Reporter," in New York Times Staff, The Newspaper: Its Making and Its Meaning

(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945), p. 94.

70. *Problems of Journalism*, A.S.N.E.'s seventh annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1929, p. 52.

71. Joseph and Stewart Alsop, *The Reporter's Trade* (New York: Reynal and Company, 1958), pp. 3-4.

72. Casper Yost to Anna Yost, April 24, April 25 and April 26, 1922.

73. *The Bulletin* of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, June 4, 1941, p. 3.

74. *Problems of Journalism*, A.S.N.E.'s fifth annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1927, p. 18.

75. *Editor and Publisher*, January 24, 1925 editorial, "New Professional Status," p. 22.

76. Hughes' notion of "license and mandate" is discussed on pp. 447-452 of his article "The Study of Occupations," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., eds., *Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects* (New York: Basic Books, 1959). See also his discussion of occupational prestige, pp. 355-356; occupational image, pp. 356-357 and the setting of goals and standards, pp. 357-358 in Evertt C. Hughes, *The Sociological Eye: Selected Papers on Work, Self and the Study of Society* (Chicago: Aldine and Artherton, 1971). Also, Everett C. Hughes, *Men and Their Work* (Glencoe: Free Press, 1958), pp. 32-33.

77. Theodore Caplow, *The Sociology of Work* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1954), pp. 139-140.

78. Eliot Freidson, *Profession of Medicine: A Study in the Sociology of Applied Knowledge* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1974), pp. xx and 338.

79. Paul Starr, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), pp. 3-15.

80. Curtis D. MacDougall, *Newsroom Problems and Policies* (New York: Macmillan, 1941), pp. 1-22.

81. Bent, pp. 228-245. Flint, pp. 7, 13, 127 and 278.

82. The fear expressed by veteran Maine editor Ernest Greuning in *The Century Magazine*, September 1924, p. 690, is echoed in *Problems of Journalism*, A.S.N.E.'s first annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1923, p. 155; also, in 1924 meeting, pp. 114-115; in 1926 meeting, p. 89; and in 1927 meeting, p. 86.

83. Problems of Journalism, A.S.N.E.'s fifth annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1927, pp. 152-153.

84. Editor and Publisher, November 8, 1924, p. 9.

85. Editor and Publisher, June 14, 1924, p. 4.

86. Problems of Journalism, A.S.N.E.'s fifth annual meeting, Washington, D.C., 1927, p. 209.

87. Ibid., p. 109.

88. Ibid., p. 86.

89. Ibid., p. 27.

90. Yost, pp. 19-20.

91. The quotation is taken from Yost's centenary poem of life on the Mississippi, written in 1909, and cited in his obituary, St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 31, 1941, p. 2.

"The Most Vindictive and Most Vengeful Power":

Labor Confronts the Chicago Newspaper Trust

Jon Bekken

Institute of Communications Research
222B Armory Building, 505 E. Armory Avenue
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820

After August 15th:

Dept of Speech, Theatre & Journalism
University of Central Arkansas
Conway, Arkansas 72032

Presented at:
Association for Education in Journalism
& Mass Communication--History Division
August, 1990

Abstract

Is the conquest of journalism by economics a recent phenomenon? More than 100 years ago, Chicago newspaper publishers entered into agreements to enhance profitability by restricting competition, consolidating newsgathering operations, and restraining labor costs. The Chicago Newspaper Association relied upon these policies to rationalize an intensively competitive market, and to protect their papers' profitability.

Although this "Newspaper Trust" included only a relative handful of the city's daily newspapers, its members dominated circulation and advertising. Efforts by rival publishers, and by Chicago's powerful labor movement, to break the grip of the Newspaper Trust were uniformly unsuccessful, as the Trust incorporated the most successful of its rivals and drove other potential competitors from the field.

Like contemporary newspaper publishers, Chicago publishers at the turn of the century were primarily in the business of making money.

"THE MOST VINDICTIVE AND MOST VENGEFUL POWER":

LABOR CONFRONTS THE CHICAGO NEWSPAPER TRUST

> The chief reason for which the paper will be published will be to make a living for the men who make the paper....
> Chicago Evening Mail, 10 August 1885

In a recent essay, Louis Liebovich urges journalism historians to pay greater attention to economic and business history, both to better understand past journalistic practices and constraints and to inform contemporary debates. "At this juncture in history," Liebovich argues, "economics have overwhelmed the newspaper industry... The newspaper and its editorial content has been more closely tied to the ups and downs of the marketplace" than to informing the public.[1] Although U.S. newspapers have always existed within the marketplace, Liebovich argues that commerce has only recently come to dominate over more traditionally journalistic concerns. Patterns of labor relations, advertising, forms of ownership and control, profitability, and related issues can no longer be neglected if we hope to understand the forces that have shaped the newspaper industry historically and to this day.

Yet while ownership patterns have certainly changed in recent decades, it is not at all clear that the conquest of journalism (at least of the media institutions that have tended to capture the attention of communication historians) by economics is a recent phenomenon. This paper briefly examines the Chicago newspaper market at the turn of the century, arguing that more than 100 years ago publishers entered into agreements to enhance profitability by restricting competition, consolidating news-gathering operations, and cutting labor costs.[2]

---

[1] Louis Liebovich, "Economics and United States Newspapers: A Reexamination of Trends in Historical Research." Midwest Journalism History Convention (AEJMC), Milwaukee, March 1989, p. 4.

Chicago, in 1880, was home to at least eleven daily newspapers, along with dozens of weekly and monthly publications. But only four of those daily newspapers were the English-language general circulation papers which have captured the attention of most journalism historians. The other seven dailies included two trade journals, and newspapers published in German, Czech and Danish and Norwegian. The number of daily newspapers rose steadily over the next fifty years, and for a time there were as many as twelve English-language general circulation dailies. But by 1930, only seven of the city's thirty-eight daily newspapers fell in this category. The other thirty-one dailies included twenty-five foreign-language dailies published in twelve languages and five trade dailies catering to the specialized needs of Chicago's commercial and professional classes.[3]

Yet while the foreign-language and trade press played vital roles within the communities that both supported and relied upon them, a relative handful of general interest publications dominated the newspaper circulation and advertising markets. These general-interest English-language dailies were both longer-lived and enjoyed larger circulations than did their more specialized counterparts. In 1930 the surviving general-interest dailies had been continuously published for an average of 44 years, and only the Times (launched the year before) had been published for less than thirty.[4]

---

[2] This research relies heavily upon the Victor Lawson papers, held at Chicago's Newberry Library. Lawson was publisher of the Daily News and the morning Record, and the dominant figure in the Newspaper Publishers Association. In addition, I have reviewed Chicago Federation of Labor records, the papers of CFL President John Fitzpatrick, and selected issues of the Chicago American, Chicago Tribune, Chronicle, Daily Calumet, Daily Socialist, Day Book, Evening Journal, Evening Mail, Post, Times, and other Chicago newspapers. Although some Chicago newspapers of the day were chain papers--and their numbers increased throughout this period as Hearst entered the market, the Tribune expanded into other cities, and outside interests bought and merged the Mail and Journal--this paper restricts itself to issues of inter-paper cooperation.

[3] Jon Bekken, "The Chicago Newspaper Scene: An Ecological Perspective." Midwest Journalism History Convention (AEJMC), Chicago, April 1990.

The Newspaper Trust

This press was dominated by a handful of highly successful publishers tightly organized into what a competing newspaper, closely linked to Chicago's powerful labor movement, denounced as

> the most cruel and the most powerful, the most vindictive and the most vengeful power in Chicago--the newspaper trust that has ruled the city by fear for so many years.[5]

The Newspaper Trust was organized by the city's leading publishers to jointly control distribution, gather and report local news, negotiate labor contracts, and to otherwise defend the publishers' economic and political interests. These publishers wielded substantial direct and indirect political influence. In 1889 and 1893, several publishers banded together to promote a "Citizens' ticket" in local elections--guaranteeing the slate's printing bills, ordering the City Press Association to carry its campaign statements, and reprimanding publishers whose papers did not use the proper nomenclature. "The Citizens' ticket should not be called the Republican ticket, but the Citizens'," Daily News publisher Victor

---

[4] Calculated from information in Winifred Gregory, ed., American Newspapers 1821-1936. New York, 1937.

[5] Day Book, "Ruth Hanna McCormick Faints When Scoring Trust Press to Store Girls," April 9, 1913, pp. 2-3.

Lawson chided the fiercely-Republican Tribune. "Harrison's ticket should not be called the Democratic ticket, but Harrison's ticket."[6] Trust publishers played a major role in municipal reform campaigns--most notably the campaign against the streetcar franchise--and did not hesitate to use their political power to advance their own economic interests.[7]

Publishers received favorable (and controversial) property tax treatment and long-term leases of public lands; city assistance in securing access to street corners in the downtown district to sell their newspapers (and for periodic attempts to bar competing papers from downtown news stands); and were able to enroll their gun thugs as police deputies to aid in labor disputes and newspaper wars.[8] Even as late as 1936 former Chicago Tribune business manager Harrison Parker blasted the Tribune's publisher for heading "the crooked political dictatorship running Chicago."[9]

---

[6] Victor Lawson papers: Outgoing Correspondence: Regular Series (henceforth Lawson papers), to City Press Bureau, 6 Dec. 1889; to James Scott, Herald, 16 Dec. 1889; to Patterson, Tribune, 17 March 1893.

[7] David Paul Nord, Newspapers and New Politics: Midwestern Municipal Reform, 1870-1900. Ann Arbor, 1981. The harried streetcar operator finally bought the Inter-Ocean to secure a favorable editorial voice.

[8] See, e.g., Chicago Daily Socialist, "Daily News Is In Big Steal," April 17, 1909, p. 3; N.D. Cochran, "The Beast of Big Business Back of the Assault on Free Speech and a Free Press," Day Book, March 29, 1913, p. 6; Harrison Parker, How the Chicago Tribune Cheated and Defrauded the State of Illinois of 87 Million Dollars in Capital Stock Taxes," Chicago, 1936; Chicago Federation of Labor, Who is Back of the Gun Men?, Chicago, 1913; and Chicago Daily Press, "When is Murder Murder?," Reprint: Rogersville, 1913. Both the latter can be found in Box 1 of the John Fitzpatrick papers, Chicago Historical Society.

[9] Harrison Parker, op cit. Parker was at the time campaigning for the third party Lemke ticket. Former Tribune writer Burton Rascoe argued, in contrast, that the paper had no political influence whatsoever, and that the Tribune's endorsed candidates were almost uniformly defeated. Rascoe,

But the Newspaper Trust was not organized to reshape Chicago politics. Each of its member papers had distinct editorial and political policies. Rather, the trust was organized to promote the publishers' business interests. Through the newspaper association--organized in 1884, and first incorporated in 1893 as the Daily Newspaper Association of Chicago--publishers were able to control costs, avoid potentially-crippling competition, and impose their own terms upon Chicago's powerful labor unions. By 1895, when Willis Abbot discussed "the strong combination of the established dailies for the purpose of restricting competition" in the course of a review of Chicago newspapers, the trust was well entrenched:

> The Publishers' Association, made up of the chief dailies, makes regulations for the guidance of its members. It prescribes what class of news shall not be printed--for example, putting the court record under the ban. It limits the inducements... which its members may offer to newsdealers. It fixes the rates of commissions to be paid agents... It has even attempted to depress the rate of editorial wages by prohibiting any member from attempting to hire a man employed by another member...[10]

Before I Forget. Garden City, 1937, pp. 267-68. Charges that publishers controlled local politics were commonplace. In 1907, for example, the *Chronicle* argued that the Dunne administration was wholly controlled by the Hearst interests--and that ridding the city of Hearstism was now the major political issue of the day. (1 April 1907, pp. 1, 6)

[10] Willis Abbot, "Chicago Newspapers and Their Makers." *Review of Reviews* 11(6), June 1895, pp. 646-47; Donald Abramoske, "The *Chicago Daily News*: A Business History, 1875-1901," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963; Edwin Emery, *History of the American Newspaper Publishers Association*, Minneapolis, 1950, p. 47. For an example of efforts to hold down editorial wages, see Lawson to Cornelius McAuliff, *Post*, 28 March 1892, protesting efforts to hire away City Press staff: "it was unanimously agreed that the papers should not disturb the bureau, nor the bureau the papers, by competitive offers to the employees..." (Lawson Papers, Outgoing Letters: Special Series: City Press Association, 1890-1894) These understandings, which were not always honored, extended also to non-editorial employees. See, e.g., Lawson to Patterson, 27 May 1893, protesting the *Tribune*'s hiring away a worker from

This cooperation began even before the Association was organized when, in the early 1880s, morning publishers developed a system where one carrier delivered all morning papers in each area, dramatically cutting distribution costs and eliminating any need for publishers to compete to deliver their morning editions first.

By the 1880s, Donald Abramoske argues, newspapers had already become big business, making it "possible and desirable for Chicago's publishers to start working together to reduce costs, to eliminate fruitless and expensive methods of competition, and to unite on questions of common interests." Formal agreements regulated various aspects of business activity, ranging from labor relations to promotional activities and advertising policies and commissions. On July 23, 1898 all of Chicago's morning newspapers adopted a uniform two cent cover price and identical wholesale terms.[11]

Just two weeks before, the publishers locked out their entire staffs and ceased publishing for four days in the midst of the Spanish-American War in order to break a strike by 60 union stereotypers seeking shorter hours. Before the strike the publishers had agreed: to refuse any attempt at compromise, that this and all future labor disputes involving any member newspaper would be handled by the Association as a whole, and that

---

the News' mailing department at the extravagant wage of $30/week.

[11]; Donald Abramoske, op cit., pp. 25, 91, 112, 127, 139. Abramoske's dissertation draws upon many of the same sources cited in this research, and also upon Chicago Daily News business records. The two-cent agreement followed a price war in which all morning papers had been compelled to cut their price to one cent, after the failure of an effort by the two-cent morning papers to drive the one-cent Record out of the market by cutting it off from the distribution system. Publishers quickly patched their prior agreements back together to stem falling profits.

in the event of a strike no newspaper would be published until all could be issued simultaneously.[12] Publishers blacklisted union militants and strikers, refused to negotiate with unions while they were out on strike, and assisted each other in securing strike-breakers.[13]

In 1890, trust publishers organized the City Press Association (in cooperation with other local newspapers, including four German-language dailies) to reduce the costs of local newsgathering. The City Press report was available to non-Trust papers only by unanimous consent of its members, and papers joining the City Press Association had to agree to "leave the nightly police work to be covered by the bureau exclusively."[14]

Yet despite this close cooperation, the Chicago newspaper market was in some ways extremely competitive in 1898. Five evening and five morning general circulation daily newspapers fought for their share of the English-language market. (A sixth morning paper launched that year, the

---

[12] F.A. Russell, "The Newspaper and Periodical Publishing Industry in Illinois from 1880 to 1915." University of Illinois Ph.D. Dissertation, 1916, pp 313-14; Abromoske, op cit., pp. 142-45.

[13] For an example of the Trust's coordinated bargaining stance see Wilson, Nixon, Medill, Scott and Lawson to Chicago Typographical Union #16, 29 April 1886 and subsequent correspondence through 29 May 1886 (the CTU unsuccessfully sought a wage increase); on blacklisting of strikers, see Lawson to Scott, 17 March 1893; on refusal to negotiate during strikes see, e.g., A.B. Adair (News foreman) to Chicago Typographical Union, 5 June 1891; on assistance in securing non-union employees see, e.g., Lawson to Patterson, 11 March 1896--all in Lawson papers.

[14] A.A. Dornfeld, Behind the Front Page: The Story of the City News Bureau of Chicago, Chicago, 1983; Agreement signed by Wm. Penn Nixon, James Scott, V.F. Lawson, R.W. Patterson, Washington Hessing and H.J. Huiskamp, 13 August 1890, in Lawson papers; Lawson to James Scott, Herald, 12 Sept. 1890, and Lawson to Times, 14 July 1894, cutting off service at Herald request (Lawson Papers, City Press Association, op cit.); and CPA ByLaws, in: Victor Lawson Papers, City Press Association of Chicago, Miscellaneous Records. Dornfeld notes that one participating daily laid off its entire local news staff, relying instead upon the City News report.

Labor World, sought the allegiance of union members but appears never to have secured a significant readership.) The Daily News dominated the evening field, but morning circulation was much more competitive. Yet publishers were reluctant to engage in an all-out battle for increased circulation. Unrestricted competition, they had learned at great cost, resulted in expensive circulation boosting campaigns, reduced revenues (through lower cover prices and lower bulk rates to distributors and newsboys), or other expenses which afforded only momentary advantages as other newspapers were soon forced to respond in kind.

"An Annoying and Profitless Competition"[15]

The Daily News' publisher, Victor Lawson, took the lead, urging his fellow publishers to adopt a more rational strategy:

> Lawson was convinced that as long as publishers refused to abandon their personal hostilities and competitive instincts in favor of 'commercial sanity,' they would be seriously handicapped in their dealings with advertisers, and independent wholesale dealers who could profit by playing one newspaper office against another. Unrestricted competition meant "extravagant wages" and "union rule."[16]

The newspaper trust maintained a low profile throughout its existence. But there was documented extensive collusion between trust publishers. Association policies prohibited payment of commissions on local advertising business, barred insertion of advertising materials by distributors, restricted the size and shape of advertisements, and required identification of paid reading materials. Other agreements limited discounts to charitable associations and commissions for advertising agents, and imposed extensive restrictions (banning billboards, kickbacks, discounts, etc) on promotional tactics. Publishers agreed to eliminate free marriage, death and birth notices; to consult before introducing expensive mechanical innovations; and to assist member papers prevented from publishing by natural disasters or labor difficulties. (See "Synopsis of the Rules of the Chicago Daily Newspaper Association", appended.) And individual publishers reached bilateral agreements fixing the time for the release of street editions, restricting extra editions (thereby saving on printers and pressmen), and limiting returns from distributors and newsboys.[17] Victor Lawson estimated that in the Association's first eight years, it had already saved publishers "hundreds of thousands of dollars."[18]

---

[15] Victor Lawson to Carter Harrison, Times, 28 Oct. 1892. Lawson was protesting the Times' circulation building tactics, which "can only be of the most ephemeral advantage to the Times, and must in the end be only demoralizing to all concerned." Lawson papers.

[16] Abramoske, op cit., pp. 113-19, 123.

The trust was at the peak of its power in 1898. The *Inter-Ocean* left the Association the next year, and when Hearst entered the Chicago market in 1900 a full-scale circulation war--complete with murders and beatings--

---

[17] An example was a 22 Dec. 1894 agreement by the evening papers not to issue extras on Christmas or New Years day. And the Association worked to enforce these agreements. See, e.g., Lawson to Scott, *Herald*, 4 Nov. 1886; to C.W. Boucher, *Mail*, 8 June 1888, 20 July 1888 (which protests the *Mail*'s appearance on the streets 1 minute early), 4 Oct. 1888; to Thos. Strayer, *Times*, 22 May 1891; to Carter Harrison, *Times*, 8 Jan. 1892 ("such methods are very bad 'form,' according to the 'Newspaper Trust' ethics")--all from Lawson Papers. Typical of bi-lateral agreements was one between the *News* and the *Mail* setting the release time for the 6pm extra (Lawson to Boucher, 17 Sept. 1888). But such bi-lateral agreements could cover more sensitive matters; see, e.g., Lawson to Seymour, *Chronicle*, 16 Jan. 1896, confirming an agreement to issue no special supplements, award no prizes for subscriptions or for solving mysteries or puzzles, and banning publishers' coupons which could be collected and redeemed for merchandise.

[18] Lawson to W.E. Bond, *Oakland Tribune*, 28 May 1892. He enclosed a copy of the Association's rules, marked "Confidential." Lawson papers.

ensued. At least twenty-seven news dealers were killed, and many others injured, before a truce was arranged in 1913, after the Trust had broken a strike by newsboys and drivers.[19] But even during the height of the circulation wars, publishers continued to present a common front against their organized employees.

In 1904, amidst the newspaper wars, the trust reorganized as the Chicago chapter of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. Chicago publishers had been active in the ANPA since it was founded in 1887, and several Chicago publishers served as national ANPA officers in the 1880s and 1890s. But until they retreated from their extraordinarily broad cooperation of those decades to a narrower (though still tight-knit) concentration upon labor questions, Chicago publishers apparently found their local association better suited for their needs. After the ANPA reached national arbitration agreements with the International Typographical Union and other printing trades unions in 1900, Chicago publishers apparently decided they could more effectively pursue their common interests through the national association's framework. Yet the ANPA's Chicago chapter included only a small fraction of the city's daily newspapers, albeit generally those with the largest circulations and the most advertising. In 1915, only seven Chicago papers--less than half the English-language dailies then being published--issued by five firms held ANPA membership.[20]

---

[19] See, e.g., Chicago Daily Socialist, "Newspaper Fight Is All Over," July 12, 1907, p. 3; and "Hearst Slugger Stabs Newsboy," Sept. 25. 1909, p. 1. The Chicago newspaper wars have been extensively discussed. John Cooney (The Annenbergs, New York, 1982), for example, discusses Hearst's hiring of the Annenberg brothers in his circulation department and the escalation from fisticuffs and intimidations to shootings. Ferdinand Lundberg (Imperial Hearst: A Social Biography, New York, 1936, pp. 151-62) provides a vivid account of the warfare, including detailed reports of typical shootings and the police complicity in allowing the carnage to continue. However, Lundberg mistakenly argues that Hearst's circulation department originated the violence; in fact, there had been clashes between the Tribune and Lawson interests years before Hearst entered the scene, though the violence had been more restrained. (Frank Waldrop, McCormick of Chicago, Englewood Cliffs, 1966, pp. 90-93)

Chicago's newspaper unions bitterly resented the publisher's coordinated bargaining stance. As long as the publishers refused to negotiate separately, or even to allow unions to enforce their work rules and jurisdiction through industrial action or boycotts (the Trust responded to both with lockouts of the involved unions from all member papers), unions were left little opportunity to press their claims for improved wages and conditions or to effectively respond to the new technologies being introduced into newspaper pressrooms. The Chicago Federation of Labor regularly discussed the ANPA publishers' anti-labor policies, placing Trust papers on the Federation's Unfair list in 1903 and again in 1912.[21] The 1903 dispute began when the Daily News refused to recognize the Mailers' Union. The dispute quickly spread to other printing crafts and to other Trust newspapers. The Publishers' Association refused to negotiate until the boycott was lifted. After five months, the Federation agreed, but the pressmen were soon asking that the boycott be resumed in hopes of forcing the publishers to modify their intransigence.[22]

---

[20] Emery, op cit.; Russell, op cit., p. 258. Some foreign-language newspapers may have had some form of ANPA affiliation, however. When the Mailers were asked, at a Chicago Federation of Labor meeting (Minutes, June 2, 1912), whether they had a contract with any Trust paper, they cited a contract with Abendpost.

[21] See, for example, CFL Minutes for August 2, 1903; October 18, 1903; January 11, 1911 and October 6, 1912.

When Hearst brought his Chicago newspapers under the ANPA contract in 1912--locking-out his pressmen when they objected--other trust publishers immediately locked-out their pressmen in sympathy with the Hearst papers. The lock-out precipitated sympathetic strikes by stereotypers, drivers and newsboys at all Trust papers. In response, the Trust reassigned its gun thugs to force striking newsboys to carry their papers and to keep non-Trust newspapers off the news stands.[23] The Chicago ANPA refused to negotiate, resolving:

> That there be no recognition in any shape or form of the alleged Newsboys' Union, and that no officer, member or employee of Chicago Local A.N.P.A. ... hold any meeting or conference with any officer or committee of said union on union business, said union not being recognized as a labor union...

Instead they approved payment of $1000 to Moses Annenberg--a veteran Hearst gunman--for unspecified strike-related services.[24]

The newsboys had long been at war with the trust and Hearst press--victim both of "circulation department" sluggers and of publishers' efforts to increase profits by squeezing the margin on bulk sales. The publishers tried to force newsboys to take larger orders, and to refrain from handling competing papers. On March 24, 1909, for example, American sluggers attacked one Willie Baker, dumping his newsstand in the streets, in an effort to stop him from selling the early edition of the Daily News. Newsboys had abandoned the American after the paper--having secured a large circulation with the active support of the newsboys who welcomed its larger margins--raised its wholesale price from 40 to 60 cents per 100 and stopped accepting returns.[25] The next day, newsboys met to formalize their organization as the Newsboys Protective Union, which immediately affiliated to the Chicago Federation of Labor. "We must organize," one newsboy argued, "or Hearst will take back everything we have gained by our decided stand when his papers tried to take away the last of our profits from us."[26]

---

[22] CFL Minutes, May 3, 1903; June 7, 1903; August 2, 1903; October 18, 1903. All reprinted in the Union Labor Advocate, June-November, 1903.

[23] N.D. Cochran, "The Beast of Big Business Back of the Assault on Free Speech and a Free Press," Day Book March 29, 1913; N.D. Cochran, "Trial of the Newspaper Gunmen who Murdered Frank Witt Putt Off Again," Day Book June 21, 1913, p. 1+. Even McCormick's highly sympathetic biographer, Frank Waldrop (op cit., pp 186-87), discusses charges that the Tribune brought in mobsters to control its drivers, though he seeks to downplay the seriousness of the incidents.

[24] Minutes, October 24, 1912. A copy can be found in Box 1 of the John Fitzpatrick papers. Extensive documents on the 1912 strike and its lengthy aftermath can be found in the Fitzpatrick papers. Philip Taft provides a useful, if unsympathetic, overview of the conflict in his "The Limits of Labor Unity: The Chicago Newspaper Strike of 1912," Labor History 19(1), 1978, pp. 100-29.

Newsboys were clearly on the defensive throughout this period, prevented from increasing their margins by the publishers' joint price setting and common terms. Like other industry workers, they had originally welcomed Hearst to the Chicago market--using the heightened competition to win better terms and promoting Hearst's paper because of its higher margin. But publishers quickly regrouped and were again refusing returns by 1907. When several newsboys tried selling a South Chicago Sunday newspaper (the Sun) instead, the trust used its clout to have them arrested.[27] A parody published in the Chicago Daily Socialist in September of 1907 noted that while the Publishers Association did not hesitate to seek government intervention against the paper manufacturers under anti-trust laws, they conspired to raise the price of newspapers to vendors with complete impunity as the laws were "reserved only to adjust the grievances of rich men like Lawson and Patterson."[28] In their battles with the publishers, newsboys were at a serious disadvantage since their newsstands were explicitly illegal--leaving them easy prey to sluggers and police.[29]

---

[25] Chicago Daily Socialist, "Hearst Rowdies Attack Newsies." March 25, 1909, p. 1.

[26] Chicago Daily Socialist, "Ban Removed From Newsboys." March 26, 1909, p. 1.

The Newspaper Trust was justifiably confident of its ability to bring the newspaper unions to heel. Without the Association and its common front, publishers could be pitted against each other by the newspaper unions. But with the sure knowledge that they would be backed up by their fellow publishers, ANPA members could afford to stand their ground.

Fighting the Trust

Chicago's labor movement opposed the Newspaper Trust because of its labor policies, but also because of the Trust press' editorial hostility to their cause.[30] None of the four general-circulation English-language dailies published in 1880 could be described as sympathetic to the labor movement. Each vigorously opposed strikes, "socialistic" tendencies and "class politics", though the News was sympathetic to labor involvement in the established political parties and towards union educational and cooperative ventures.[31] But even the News repeatedly earned the enmity of organized labor, as a result of its labor practices, business policies and its news columns. In 1886, for example, Lawson reassured stereotypers that "I believed in the propriety and wisdom of trades union organization" but that "if the work of the stereotypers department was of such a character that it could be advantageously done by six girls from our subscription department whom we are paying $6.00 a week to, we should consider that we had a perfect right to have the work done in that way."[32]

---

[27] Chicago Daily Socialist: "Dealers War on Chicago Papers," December 3, 1907, p. 1; "Newsdealers In Grip of Papers," December 4, 1907, p. 1; "Newsies Scare Sunday Papers," January 22, 1908, p. 1.

[28] "Newsboys To Sue Victor Lawson Newspaper Trust." September 20, 1907, p. 2.

[29] Chicago Daily Socialist, "News Stands on Chicago Streets." March 26, 1909, p. 6 (Editorial).

[30] See, e.g., Meatcutters' official C.E. Schmidt's letter referring to the labor press as "the only press that would take the interests of the toiling masses in consideration." April 1, 1903; in Mary McDowell papers, folder 15A, Chicago Historical Society.

Chicago unions not only expected the newspapers they were asked to read to deal fairly with their employees, they also demanded that those newspaper contents not undermine their strikes against other employers. CFL minutes contain several examples of unions protesting the publication of advertisements for goods produced by non-union concerns and Help-Wanted notices for strikebreakers. In its effort to gain labor readers, the Chicago Daily Socialist regularly scored its competitors--noting that on one day alone, four Chicago papers had carried 69 advertisements for strikebreakers. "Advertisements for strike breakers are refused at the office of the Chicago Daily Socialist, but even were they to appear in its columns it would be money wasted."[33]

---

[31] Zonita Stewart Jeffrys (1936): "The Attitude of the Chicago Press Toward the Local Labor Movement, 1873 to 1879." University of Chicago Masters' Thesis.

[32] Lawson to Melville Stone, 28 May 1886. The Trades & Labor Assembly protested, in 1888, "scurrilous political advertisements [which] have appeared in The Evening News, inserted for the purpose of injuring the character and reputation of... a delegate of this assembly." (Minute Book, October 25, 1888; Chicago Historical Society)

Publishers actively courted unionists as readers, as in a September 1903 edition of the Union Labor Advocate stuffed with advertisements in which the Trust dailies boasted of their extensive labor coverage and their sympathy for organized labor. An ad on page 1 of that issue proclaimed "The Tribune Prints Fair Labor News." Inside a full-page advertisement proclaimed that "all Union Labor is treated better than it was before Mr. Hearst came to town." Other inside pages bore (presumably purchased) editorial plugs for the Tribune ("labor has been greatly benefitted by the generous and unsolicited support"), American ("its daily appearance is hailed as a hopeful harbinger by the grand army of labor"), the Daily News ("the strong position in which the labor army finds itself can be greatly attributed to the wise counsel, kindly admonition and general ability of the News"), the Record-Herald ("a sane paper for sane people"), Inter-Ocean ("certainly the paper the working people should read"), and the Chronicle ("favorable to free institutions without special grants to the select few").[34] But few signs of such a pro-labor policy could be found in the newspapers themselves.

Relations between the major publishers and the labor movement were to remain strained for decades.[35] So bitter was the conflict that Chicago Federation of Labor President John Fitzpatrick declared, in 1913, that he refused to speak to reporters from the trust newspapers.[36] That same year Day Book editor N.D. Cochran spoke before the Illinois Federation of Labor convention, explaining that as an adless paper, the Day Book

---

[33] See, e.g., CFL Minutes for November 16, 1913; Chicago Daily Socialist, "Newspapers As Enemies: Publications Supported by Pennies of Workers Strike to Defeat Unions." October 3, 1907, p. 2.

[34] The Union Labor Advocate had its status as the CFL's official organ revoked a few years later due to longstanding objections from CFL delegates to its advertising policies.

> could not be controlled by big business or advertising interests. That it was wholly within the control of the workers... and would at all times tell the truth as against the suppressed news of the newspaper Trust in Chicago who dare not print the news for fear of injuring their advertisers."[37]

And in 1918, when the CFL was launching a labor party to contest Chicago's governance by "labor-hating plutocrats and politicians," the Federation's officers vowed "to expose the Trust Press and the vested interests they represent" by launching a daily labor newspaper.[38]

A steady stream of new publishers sought to gain readers by positioning themselves as the newspaper for Chicago's English-speaking working class. In 1898, the Daily Labor World made its debut as a paper explicitly published in the interests of organized labor. For the next few years the Labor World was published from a building housing the daily Republican and the German-language Der Daily Republikaner. Its masthead bore the mottoes "Champion of ORGANIZED LABOR" and "Published in the Interest of ORGANIZED LABOR" and a prominent union label, though the paper had no known affiliation to any labor organizations. While there was little else on the paper's front page, besides its conservative typography and design, to distinguish it from other papers, the second page prominently displayed union labels and communications from national and local unions. The Labor World was at first warmly welcomed by the labor movement--receiving endorsements from AFL president Samuel Gompers and officials of local unions.[39]

---

[35] See, e.g., Chicago Daily Socialist, "Blow for the Bad Newspapers." September 13, 1907, p. 1. (Reports a resolution by CTUA Local 1 condemning the unfair attitudes of the Tribune, Record-Herald, Daily News, and Daily Journal.

[36] Inter Ocean, "'Go Beyond Law,' Unions Advised by Labor Chief," January 6, 1913; in Scrapbook 1912-1925 in Fitzpatrick papers. Several similar instances of hostility towards the dominant papers' editorial positions can be cited from Fitzpatrick's papers, and from other Chicago labor officials. George Seldes, who worked for the Tribune, contended that "No newspaper in America has such an unbroken record of labor-baiting as the Chicago Tribune." Lords of the Press, New York, 1938, p. 47.

[37] Reprinted in: Chicago Federation of Labor Minutes, October 19, 1913, pp. 12-13.

[38] Letter from J. Fitzpatrick and E. Nockels to Affiliated CFL Locals, November 20, 1918. Fitzpatrick Papers, Box 7.

But whatever support it had garnered quickly collapsed when Randolph Hearst entered Chicago's crowded newspaper market in 1900. Hearst, too, was quick to identify his paper as an organ for Chicago's embattled working man.[40] For several years, Hearst's paper enjoyed close relations with the Chicago Federation of Labor. But Hearst's editorial and business policies (in particular, carrying advertisements for struck jobs) had undermined those ties well before the 1912 newspaper strike--which began when Hearst locked out his printers--irrevocably discredited his papers with the labor movement. When the Chicago Daily Socialist was launched in 1906, it did everything it could to further undercut Hearst's labor ties, gleefully reprinting items about strikes against Hearst properties.[41] "Hearst's eastern papers are great friends of western labor," one article concluded, "and his western papers are valiant champions of eastern labor, but somehow the rule doesn't apply at home."[42]

---

[39] Daily Labor World 3(23), January 27, 1900. Two pages of what was presumably a four-page issue are held by the Chicago Historical Society; these include no staff box or other indication of the paper's sponsorship.

[40] The Labor World responded by reprinting 1898 letters of endorsement from prominent union officials--apparently such support was no longer forthcoming, as no more recent endorsements were reprinted in the single surviving issue I have been able to locate.

In March of 1912, the CFL approved a resolution declaring that "Hearst's character and conduct, industrially, politically and journalistically, are so saturated with egotism, ambition and avarice as to place him outside of the pale of influence with any self-respecting, liberty-loving organization," and blasting the Hearst press' "maliciously vicious lies, distorted facts, innuendo of the most scurrilous type," etc.[43] Sixteen months later, the CFL declared that the Hearst press used its control of City government--obtained under the guise of being a friend of labor--to promote a reign of terror against union members and citizens alike.[44] The Chicago Daily Socialist, published from 1906 through 1912, also persistently identified itself as the labor movement's newspaper, regularly denouncing the other dailies for their hostility to organized labor. And when Scripps launched his Day Book shortly before the 1912 strike it, too, positioned itself as the organ of the "95% who work for a living."

---

[41] See, e.g., Chicago Daily Socialist, "Hearst in New Bid for Labor," 13 August 1908, p. 2; "Trying to Break the Strike," 15 August 1907, p. 4; "Unions Boycott Hearst Paper," 28 February 1908, p. 1; "Hearst Helps Break Strikes," 25 March 1908, p. 1.

[42] "Hearst Looks for Breakers," October 11, 1907, p. 2.

[43] Adopted March 3, 1912. The text was reprinted, under the headline "Organized Labor Speaks," in the Union Labor Advocate for March 30, 1912, p. 8.

[44] CFL Minutes, July 20, 1913, pp. 4-6.

Chicago's strong labor movement--and the labor movement's deep dissatisfaction with the existing newspapers--made such appeals an attractive marketing strategy throughout the period. As late as 1929, when the Daily Times entered the market, it proclaimed that it would be "a leader of the honest and progressive, a friend of the unfortunate or oppressed, and a scourge to any who misuse public franchise or public office to exploit the people."[45]

But while such policies offered important advantages to new entrants, publishers quickly found that economic prosperity demanded a different orientation. Few studies have been done in this area, but there is no reason to suspect that Chicago publishers were in any way unique in cooperating to promote their mutual economic interests. In his study of early Cincinnati papers, for example, John Nerone found that publishers competed in many areas, but "agreed on uniform prices for advertising as early as 1814."[46] Similar agreements and organizations most likely existed in other newspaper markets as well. Through organizations such as the Publishers Association, newspapers were enabled to gain the upper hand over their workforce and to control a wide range of costs in news gathering, advertising sales, production and distribution. The result may well have been a certain uniformity, as Willis Abbot contended in 1895. But Chicago's newspaper publishers knew that was a small price to pay. For, like publishers today, they were primarily in the business of making money.

---

[45] cited from Mary Ann Weston, "Chicago's Tabloid Times: Jazz Journalism in the Windy City." Unpublished paper presented to American Journalism Historians Association, Atlanta, October 1989.

[46] John Nerone, The Culture of the Press in the Early Republic: Cincinnati, 1793-1848. New York, Garland, 1989, p. 49.

SYNOPSIS OF THE RULES OF THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION*

No member shall advertise in the publications of any advertising agencies.

No member shall advertise in street, steam or elevated cars.

No member shall advertise in a catalog, price-list, book, baseball scoresheet or sporting card or bulletin, or other publication of any local newspaper advertiser.

No commission shall be allowed any advertising agent on Chicago business for any Daily or Weekly published by any member.

No man soliciting advertising for one member shall be paid commission for business given to another.

Advertising which runs across the tops of several columns and down the page in unequal distances shall be discouraged.

All advertising matter that may have the appearance of reading matter and is ordered inserted at display rates shall be indented one pica em on each side of the column.

Display advertisements two columns wide must be fifty lines deep; three columns wide seventy-five lines deep; four columns wide one hundred lines deep; five columns wide one hundred and twenty-five lines deep; and six columns wide one hundred and fifty lines deep.

Business with the railroads shall be done on a cash basis only.

Upon the order of the Association a card shall be hung in the circulation room of each paper in the Association notifying carriers, train-boys and newsboys that the sale of papers will be stopped to those who stamp advertisements upon the margins, or insert in the papers advertising bills, cards, or election tickets or posters.

The discount to be allowed on charitable advertisements shall be fifty per cent.

A violation of any of the rules of the Association subjects the offender to a fine of $100, which shall be paid into the treasury of the Association.

The Association shall meet on the last Thursday of each month.

*Undated typescript, in Lawson papers, 26 January 1891 - 9 July 1891, pp. 330-31. The agreement was amended from time to time, and supplemented by special agreements. In 1893, for example, the Association decided "On and after Nov. 1st, 1893, marriage, birth and death notices shall be charged for at the rate of fifty cents for five lines or less..." (Lawson to Scott, 20 Dec. 1893; citing minutes for 26 October). On 5 May 1896, morning publishers agreed not to send papers to Peoria or Indianapolis in advance of the usual mail service. And on 11 May 1895 publishers agreed not to use vending machines to sell newspapers.

Judith Knelman

Lucrezia Borgia in Albion
Images of Female Criminals c. 1850

In the Victorian period, female criminals, like any others of the sex, were subject to stereotyping. Women were supposed to be soft, fragile, timid, compliant creatures under the protection and control of men. For the most part, the criminals among them were not as direct as male criminals. If such women objected to the presence in their lives of a husband or a child, they might quietly solve the problem with poison -- traditionally a woman's weapon. As historian John Beattie explains,

> Poisoning has been thought to be . . . typical of women's murder . . . . It is of course natural that it should be, not because women are secretive by nature or that their crimes are necessarily masked to a greater degree than men's, but because they had abundant opportunities to doctor food and drink and because poisoning was clearly much safer especially against a husband than some more open method.[1]

By the middle of the nineteenth century, poisoning, probably as a result of newspaper publicity, was an activity thought to be dominated by women. The perceived imbalance of the sexes in this area of crime -- despite a report to Parliament in 1850 indicating that in the previous decade 57 per cent of poisoners had been women[2] --led the government in 1851 to the point of discriminating against all women.

In England in the 1840s, poisonings by women were well covered in the press. Between 1846 and 1851, the newspapers published not only lengthy reports on the inquests, trials and executions but also leading articles about a string of poisonings in Essex. The Times, for example, devoted a column and a half twice in September 1846 to reports of an inquest into the death of two children of an Essex woman, Sarah Chesham, who was widely believed to have poisoned other children as well, and it also ran an editorial criticizing the complacency of a society that would quietly allow such behavior.[3] Later The Times would say that in Essex "the use of arsenic became a kind of family secret -- a weapon in the hands of the weaker vessel by which an ill-favoured husband or a troublesome family might be readily put out of the way."[4] Chesham's career was finally halted in 1851, when she was executed for having given poison to her husband. She denied this charge to the end, though she was willing to admit that she had poisoned other people.

In 1848, after another Essex woman, Mary May, was hanged for the poisoning of her half-brother, a coroner's inquiry was launched into poisoning activities in Essex. It was suspected that May had poisoned her first husband and several of her children as well. Before her execution, she seems to have revealed the existence of a ring of women who poisoned for death benefits, but the inquests resulting from her information did not lead to any more murder convictions. There was considerable public interest in this case partly because May's criminal activities seemed so brazen and partly because they seemed part of an epidemic. A large crowd turned out to see the first execution of a woman in the county in nearly 50 years.

But the public could not delude itself that poisoning was confined to east Essex. At one point in 1849 there were three women awaiting execution in other parts of England: Rebecca Smith, who had poisoned her children in Wiltshire, Mary-Ann Geering, who had poisoned her husband and children near Hastings, and Charlotte Harris, who had poisoned her husband in Bath.[5] The case of Rebecca Smith was particularly horrifying: in a grotesque parody of the Madonna image, she had successively snuffed out the lives of eight infants by applying arsenic to her nipples.

These cases provoked alarm in the editorial quarters of the country's newspapers, which deplored the ease with which poison could be procured and the leniency and credulousness of coroners. They also fed the public's interest in crime. The newspapers seem to have thought it safest to present female criminals as unfeminine. Mary May, a rather large woman, was described in several newspaper reports as "repulsive-looking." Sarah Chesham, who had been since 1846 bare-facedly denying what everyone in east Essex knew to be true, was "masculine-looking." When she was finally convicted, she "walked with a firm step from the dock." This was not womanly behavior. Nor, indeed, was killing off men and children for the £8 to £10 each they would bring from burial societies. Women who followed these stories may have been fascinated; men were alarmed.

Bold crimes by females seemed to be proliferating in the late 1840s and the early part of the next decade. There was, of course, at this time a literary interest in bold females and even a suggestion -- albeit an ironic one -- that virtue was a bore. The Victorian recipe for domestic bliss, as spelled out in a popular weekly newspaper, was in danger:

> If your husband occasionally looks a little troubled when he comes home, do not say to him, with an alarmed countenance, "What ails you, my dear?" Don't bother him; he will tell you of his own accord, if need be. Don't rattle a hailstorm of fun about his ears either -- be observant and quiet. Don't suppose whenever he is silent and thoughtful that you are of course the cause. Let him alone until he is inclined to talk; take up your book or your needlework (pleasantly,, cheerfully, no pouting -- no sullenness) and wait until he is inclined to be sociable. Don't ever let him find a shirt-button missing. A shirt-button being off a collar or wristband has frequently produced the first hurricane in

> married life. Men's shirt collars never fit exactly -- see that your husband's are made as well as possible, and then, if he does fret a little about them, never mind it; men have a prescriptive right to fret about shirt collars.[6]

The very appearance of these "hints for wives" suggests that women were rejecting this code. One problem was that the factory system was promoting equality. Liberals like J.S. Mill welcomed the prospect of female emancipation, but to the more conservative elements it was a threat. A leading article in the popular News of the World deplored the way in which the new economy allowed women to earn their living other than as wives and mothers:

> In the bulk, the best wages and the most certain employment fall to . . . young persons and women: the natural head of the family is deposed; the young persons are prematurely independent. Children are an infliction: . . . to have a child, means to pay half-a-crown a week to a woman who trades in nursing, until the child be old enough to enter a factory; unless a burial-society should offer a more ready source of profit. In short, throughout large sections of our population, the family is broken up, and the family instincts are destroyed.[7]

This same debate was being carried on at a somewhat higher level in literature. Thackeray emphasizes the blandness of conventional heroes and heroines by calling Vanity Fair (1848) "a novel without a hero." Becky Sharp may have finished near the bottom of the wheel of fortune, but while she was at the top her life was undeniably more interesting than Amelia's or Dobbin's. Jane Eyre (1847) too suggests that the life that society has constructed for women is so confining as to foster rebellion: the heroine believes women "suffer from too rigid a restraint, too absolute a stagnation, precisely as men would suffer" (Chapter 12).

What had long been regarded as the law of nature was being questioned in the highest quarters. Even the leadership afforded by the young Queen Victoria, though she deferred in domestic affairs to Prince Albert, was a contradiction of the tradition of female dependency. And the bold activity of female criminals -- their rebellion against the code as well as the law -- perhaps added to the blurring of gender lines. Convention and decorum seemed to mean less than in the past.

Though male criminals were under no obligation to uphold the image of their sex, a woman who apparently[8] strangled and then set fire to her elderly mother because she had grown tired of waiting for her to die supposedly shamed all women. The Weekly Times called the inappropriately named Mercy Newton a "female fiend."[9] The Daily News commented that the evidence against her proved "a barbarity and fierceness of disposition not merely irreconcilable with filial feelings, but absolutely with those of the sex which she disgraces."'"

But Newton's was a crime of the rural lower class. The threat broadened the same year, 1849, when a glamorous female criminal with ties to the upper class came into the public eye in London. For the three months between the time the murder of her lover was committed and she and her husband were executed, hardly a day passed without coverage of this case in the newspapers. Maria Manning was portrayed as decisive, fierce, cunning, and ruthless. She was also attractive, exotic, and reasonably well connected, having been, as the papers noted, a maid to Lady Blantyre, a daughter of the Duchess of Sutherland. Though her spirit was "masculine," this was a distinctly female figure whose grooming and attention to her wardrobe at the trial were made much of in the newspapers. Her weak and passive husband was by comparison "feminine."

Since circumstantial evidence made it obvious that at least one of them was guilty, they hired separate lawyers and proceeded to accuse one another of having committed the crime unaided. Said the *News of the World* after the execution:

> Manning's wife died without confession, up to the last moment denying her guilt, or at least refusing to acknowledge it, and *exhibiting an amount of courage and nerve which contrasted strangely with the terror-stricken aspect of her husband*. There has been a *diabolical energy of character* displayed by her throughout, which has attracted to her conduct a still larger share of public attention than to that of Manning. Her handsome figure, foreign origin, and various other considerations, contributed to this effect. If we turn away from the male criminal with sensations of loathing and disgust, we cannot gaze upon the woman without the deeper emotions of execration and horror. The murderess of her paramour, she has also -- if her partner in guilt has not left the world with a lie on his lips --been as far as in her lay, the murderess of her husband too. If, as his tale -- corroborated in no small degree by the *more than masculine violence of her character* -- would lead us to believe, she, and not he, was the actual assassin. . . ."

In summing up his case, Frederick Manning's lawyer warned the jury against sexual stereotyping. He said:

> We are all in the habit of associating the female character with the idea of mildness and obedience, and that of the male with the idea of power and strength. It is not necessary, however, to come to the conclusion that this rule is an universal one. History teaches us that the female is capable of reaching higher in point of virtue than the male, but that

> when once she gives way to vice she sinks far lower than our sex."[12]

Women of the upper class seemed unduly eager to see this emblem of the degradation of their sex. They crowded the spectators' gallery of the courtroom and turned out to watch the execution through opera glasses at a safe distance from the crowd of 20,000.[13] Newspaper accounts suggest that she was, in a perverse way, an inspiration. Thackeray could not have done a better job of creating a character who was as appealing as she was evil.

Perhaps women's interest in crime made men uneasy. In any event, newspaper reporters and judges seemed to disapprove of their presence at sensational trials and hangings. An account the apprehension of Frederick Manning in Jersey noted that on the boat to London passengers gathered to gawk, and "among the eager spectators, we observed more than one female whose dress and outward appearance would have led us to expect a greater degree of delicacy of feeling."[14] A similar reproach from a reporter came in this observation at the trial of the notorious murderer James Rush: "To the credit of the ladies of Norwich few were present."[15] The Weekly Chronicle headed the following item "The Softer Sex":

> At the Northampton Assizes, the other day, in the course of a trial for poisoning, before Baron A. Herson, several interruptions took place in consequence of the overcrowded state of the court. The crowd consisted chiefly of women, two of whom fainted, upon which the learned judge expressed his surprise that women should be so anxious to be present at such dreadful investigations. It was, however, a matter of taste. They were called "the softer sex," but he thought incorrectly.[16]

At Sarah Chesham's execution, which attracted about 7,000 spectators, according to the same paper,

> There were hardly any respectable people observable in the crowd, but a most disgusting number of women. Some of these had gay flowers in their bonnets, and evidently set up for rustic belles; others were mothers, giving suck to infants, whom they carried in their arms; others were elderly matrons, presiding at the head of their families, and from the elevation of the domestic spring cart pointing out to their young daughters how they could best see the execution.[17]

The execution of Rebecca Smith, said the Globe, "attracted a throng of persons of all grades and shades of character," including pickpockets. The paper took to task one Mrs. Taylor, who had travelled some distance for the event and was robbed at a pub later in the day. A leading article commented:

> The evident carelessness and lightness with which she beheld the extreme penalty of the law carried out in the person of one of her own sex, are both surprising and repulsive. The imagination can scarcely realize, in the form of a woman, such indifference to another's suffering. We put out of the question those unfortunate creatures doomed, either by the accident of birth or by dire misfortune, to degradation and ignorance, and behold a woman, to all appearances surrounded by those ties and comforts which make up the life of her sex, calmly walk forth in broad day from her home to see Rebecca Smith strangled before the County Jail.'[18]

Clearly, women were a disappointment. Their emancipation in all spheres was disconcerting to men who wanted them to stay on a pedestal out of harm's way.

Even the House of Lords seemed to feel that women needed to be contained. The Earl of Carlisle introduced a bill there in March of 1851 to regulate the sale of arsenic, observing that the use of poison "seemed to attract and fascinate a certain class of minds more than any other kind of crime."[19] This was evidently a response to the conviction of Sarah Chesham. On March 8, The Times noted that in Essex the use of arsenic had been "a kind of family secret -- a weapon in the hands of the weaker vessel by which an ill-favoured husband or a troublesome family might be readily put out of the way."[20] On March 24, one day before the execution, as the bill was being given third reading, its sponsor produced an amendment that implicitly identified women as potential poisoners. The sale of arsenic was to be restricted to adult males.

Protesting that this was "a gross insult to every woman in the country," Mill wrote to the Home Secretary, Sir George Grey, urging him to intervene before the bill was passed by the House of Commons. He could not believe, he said, that "so monstrous a proposition" could have obtained the assent of government except through inadvertence. He argued:

> If the bill passes with this clause, it is a retrograde step in legislation, a return to the ideas and practices of barbarous ages. One of the characteristics of the improved spirit of the present time is the growing tendency to the elevation of women -- towards their relief from disabilities, their increased estimation, the assignment to them of a higher position, both social & domestic. But this clause is a blind step in the reverse direction. It singles out women for the purpose of degrading them. It establishes a special restriction, a peculiar disqualification against them alone. It assumes that women are more addicted than men to committing murder! Does the criminal calendar, or the proceedings of the police courts, shew a preponderance of women among the most atrocious criminals? . . . While the spirit of the age & the

> tendency of all improvement is to make women the equals of men, this bill puts on them the stamp of the most degrading inferiority, precisely where the common voice of mankind proclaims them superior -- in moral goodness.
>
> . . . . The legislature will not declare that Englishmen cannot be trusted with poisons, but it is not ashamed to assert that Englishwomen cannot. . . . Is it the part of a legislature to shape its laws to the accidental peculiarities of the latest crime reported in the newspapers? If the last two or three murderers had been men with red hair, as well might Parliament have rushed to pass an Act restricting all red haired men from buying or possessing deadly weapons.[21]

As Mill observed in On Liberty several years later, it would not be right to prohibit the manufacture and sale of poison unless it was never bought or used for any purpose but to commit murder.[22] Nor, by the same token, was it right to prohibit the sale of poison to women unless all women used it to commit murder. It was a question of how far liberty might legitimately be invaded for the prevention of crime. In his view, a law was simply unthinkable that would degrade all women because some of them were criminals.

Mill conducted many of his arguments in the newspapers, but this one needed prompt action. The bill amended in the House of Lords in March had its first reading in the Commons on April 7. Mill's letter is dated May 5. There is no record of the government's response to his objections, but the bill that received third reading on May 23 and was passed without debate does not contain the offending clause.

It was perhaps of some satisfaction to the female population of England that the central figure in the next sensational poisoning case, which featured strychnine rather than arsenic, was a man, William Palmer, in 1855.

Judith Knelman

Graduate School of Journalism

University of Western Ontario

1.Crime and the Courts in England 1660-1800 (Princeton: University Press, 1986), 101.

2.The Annual Register of World Events, 1850 (London: Longman, 1851), 110, says that of the 170 poisoners tried in England between 1839 and 1849, 92 were women and 78 men.

3.Times, 5 Sept. 1846, p. 7; 19 Sept. 1846, p. 3; 21 Sept. 1846, p. 4.

4.Times, 8 March 1851, p. 4.

5.Daily News, 21 Aug. 1849, p. 4.

6.Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper, 30 July 1848, p. 8.

7.News of the World, 6 Aug. 1846, p. 6.

8.Though she was finally acquitted after three trials, two with a hung jury, there seems little doubt of her guilt.

9.Weekly Times, 5 Aug. 1849, p. 567.

10.Daily News, 2 Aug.. 1849, p. 4)

11.News of the World, 18 Nov. 1849, p. 3, italics mine.

12.Observer supplement, 28 Oct. 1849, p. 3.

13.Times, 17 Nov. 1849, p. 4.

14.Globe, 3 Sept. 1849, p. 1.

15.Bell's Life in London, 1 April 1849, p. 8.

16.Weekly Chronicle,, 9 March 1851, p. 71.

17.Weekly Chronicle, 30 March 1851, p. 127.

18.Globe, 15 Sept. 1849, p. 2.

19.Hansard, p. 1300 [March 13], 1851, vol. 14.

20.Times, 8 March 1851, p. 4.

21.Mill, Letter 48, 5 May 1851, Collected Works 14, 63-64.

22.J.S. Mill, On Liberty, Chapter 5.

JUdith Knelman

Subtly Sensational
A Study of Early Victorian Crime Reporting

Sensational reporting as we know it is not much in evidence in mid-Victorian newspapers. But the absence of front-page exposure, blaring headlines, colorful language, and dramatic opening paragraphs can be deceiving. In the 1840s the news was not always as bland as the gray, dense newspapers made it look: indeed, violent crime was flourishing and the news could be shocking and gruesome. The change in the presentation of crime in newspapers is probably due more to our perception of a news story, the influence of television and the technology at the newspapers' disposal than to a lack of imagination on the part of earlier criminals or reporters.

Still, in 1887, when R.D. Blumenfeld first came into Fleet Street, he says in his memoirs,the morning papers were great heavy-sided blanket sheets full of dull advertisements and duller news announcements. They all looked alike and all were equally heavy."[1] Another chronicler of that period writes:

> The theory of The Times was that as every reader knew by experience that every word in the paper was indispensable, he worked his way through the entire solid and black print, from the first page to the last.[2]

In any period, the most sensational reporting concerns events that are seen to threaten the people reading about them. Many bizarre crimes that today would be blown up in the newspapers for what they tell us about the depravity of man were reported fully and faithfully in the middle of the nineteenth century, but unimaginatively, perhaps because it was safe to believe that by and large depravity was confined to the criminal class and perhaps also because today newspaper readership, like depravity, cuts across all classes.

Richard Altick has shown, in Deadly Encounters, a study of the press coverage of two murders in 1861, how the lurid descriptions and breathless reporting captured the public imagination so strongly that it influenced the writing of even the great Victorian novelists. But, as the examples in Thomas Boyle's Black Swine in the Sewers of Hampstead confirm, this sort of journalism appears from time to time long before 1861, usually inspired by exhibitions of depravity affecting the middle or upper class. It is much in evidence in the 1840s, a decade that recorded a great deal of violent crime.

The Times, which had by far the biggest circulation, was interested almost exclusively in what affected the upper and mercantile classes. In the 40s and early 50s, the other morning papers -- the *Advertiser*, the *Chronicle*, the *Herald*, the *Post*, and the *Daily News*, and the evening papers -- the *Express*, the *Standard*, the *Globe*, and the *Sun* -- followed suit. Crime was generally reported on faithfully and tediously, but from time to time a case would emerge that stirred the public imagination.

Emotions were manipulated in the papers of the 1840s and 50s not by typographical appearance or provocative wording but, most often, by the space allotted day after day to a given story. As is true today, the publication of leading articles and letters to the editor also signalled a story of extraordinary interest. The provision of personal details -- how a prisoner looked or behaved, for example, or who attended a trial, was another indication then, as now. Digging by a reporter for news that other papers did not have was less common at that time and therefore a clear sign that a story was extremely important. The one area in which sensational reporting of the 1840s exceeded that of our own time is in jeopardizing a fair trial. Newspaper editors of that period, sputtering with indignation at a particularly heinous crime, sometimes prodded the police make arrests and convicted suspects even before they were arrested.

In the 1840s, daily newspapers appealed to the section of the population who could read and had the five pence to buy them. These people had the time to absorb the news however it was presented. By our standards, their newspapers were intimidating to the eye, with small type, advertisements thickly covering the front page, perfunctory headlines (*e.g.*,"The Bermondsey Murder" day after day, or, for variety, "The Murder at Bermondsey"), long, drawn-out verbatim accounts by police and witnesses, and gaping holes in information. Reporters would sometimes go to the scene of the crime, especially if it had taken place in London, but when they got there they rarely asked questions.

The roasting to death of a seven-year-old by her mother,[3] the strangulation of another child by a mother who had tied her to a bedpost as punishment,[4] the murder of an elderly mother by a daughter who made no bones about the fact that she was tired of waiting for her modest inheritance,[5] the murder of a guard by a prisoner who resented being asked whether it was true that he had committed incest[6] -- all these were recognized as stories of more than routine interest in the 1840s. They were presented and commented on, but they were not flaunted. The public was allowed not to know about them if it so chose. They were interesting but not sensational.

What made sensational news? Executions sometimes attracted crowds of 20,000 or more. Reports of these, eagerly followed, were often supplemented by eleventh-hour confessions extracted by clergymen in exchange for salvation. Murder trials involving respectable citizens were regarded as a form of entertainment. They were "reviewed" in tedious chronological detail, with comments in the early paragraphs on who was at the trial and how the prisoner looked. Because it was titillating to contemplate upheaval in the establishment and comforting to see order imposed, the public disgrace of a representative of an established institution -- e.g., a lawyer who had abused his servant -- was of great interest to newspaper readers of the mid-nineteenth century.

Dickens, Thackeray and Trollope catered to these tastes but as a means of drawing attention to social ills. And just as the Victorian novelists promoted a moral code, the best journalists presented the material of real life so as to reinforce the prevailing ideals. The greater the deviation from the way in which people were expected to look and behave, the more sensational the story. The murder of his mistress by a Quaker aroused the interest of the general public because Quakers are not expected to commit murders, let alone have mistresses. Mary May and Sarah Chesham, the Essex poisoners, were described as, respectively, repulsive-looking and masculine-looking. They had to be presented as visibly unnatural because their behavior threatened public notions of motherhood and of male dominance. The attractive murderess Maria Manning was berated by the press for her attention to her wardrobe. Her stout insistence that the slaying of her lover was all her husband's fault made her even more unnatural; her husband's readiness to confess to his small part in the crime made him seem as feminine as she did masculine. Another way of saying this is that her sexual freedom and his lack of chivalry constituted an implicit threat to the social order.

II

The thinking and reading public of the early 1840s realized that things were not what they seemed, yet from day to day they were content to be deluded by appearances. Reminders that their world was in flux came to them in the form of sensational news stories. There was great excitement, for example, in the press in January of 1845, when John Tawell, whom the world knew as a respectable married businessman and a Quaker, was unmasked as a murderer. A former chemist, he had on New Year's Day given a lethal dose of prussic acid to a woman of the lower class who been maintaining a home for their two young children. "There can be no doubt that he furnishes an example of hypocrisy, a parallel for which would be vainly sought for in the criminal annals of any country," the Advertiser commented after his execution.

The story had sex if not glamour, pathos -- his execution swiftly made the children double orphans -- and the constant promise of surprise as it was unravelled. For three months, newspaper readers were entertained by analyses of the character and background of this most unlikely murderer.

> The annals of crime may furnish more atrocious criminals, but there was that in the organisation or mental constitution of this man, which distinguishes him from all others,

said the *Advertiser*.

> His love of a good reputation, which all men are anxious to preserve unstained, seemed to him so valuable, that he stopped at no crime to uphold it. He seemed so careful of what *appeared* to be valuable, that he shrunk from no deed however *really* criminal. He distributed money in charity with the very hand that but a moment before attempted murder, and actually committed it, that he might not be considered unfaithful.[7]

The tone of the first report in *The Times* and several other newspapers is calm, but there are clues that suggest a scandal. The dispatch suggests a discrepancy in the social standing of the two principals. The accused murderer is apparently a Quaker and therefore, like the jury, "highly respectable"; the victim, Sarah Hart, is "a female," *i.e.*, a member of the lower class, someone rather insignificant. The reporter announces dramatically that the murder "has created the greatest excitement for miles around" before providing the customary verbatim testimony of witnesses at the inquest.[8]

Criminals were often described in mid-nineteenth-century newspapers as worn and unattractive. Tawell was described as

> a rather tall man, approaching his 60th year, but looking older than he is in reality. His hair is of a greyish colour, and very short. His face and features are small. The expression of his countenance is not pleasing; there is something sinister about it, which may, however, be partly accounted for from a slight squint in one of his eyes . . . .[9]

While the inquest was going on, the papers were conducting their own investigation and trial. "Additional particulars" were that Tawell had long ago been transported for forgery and cast out by the Quakers. Furthermore, he had been a chemist, and "of course aware of the peculiar properties of potassium."[10] Sarah

Hart, "a very superior person for one in her station in society," had been nurse to Tawell's dying first wife and had expected to marry him. Instead, he moved up a notch in society by marrying a respectable widow, and at the time of the murder was well enough off to have kept six servants."[11]

By the time the trial began on March 12 the public knew that John Tawell was not the pillar of society that his appearance and demeanour suggested. He had a criminal record, he had been on the scene at the time Sarah Hart was murdered, and he had bought the poison that killed her. It was obvious that he had been trying to keep up a position in society at the risk of being exposed as the father of his former housekeeper's children, and that he had thought he could eliminate the risk.

The great demand for seats in the courtroom gives some indication of the thirst there must have been for newspaper accounts of the trial. The *Herald* reported:

> The scene at Aylesbury this morning, at half-past eight o'clock in the Market-place, and at the entrance to the court, was one of the most animated and eminently disorderly that could possibly be imagined. . . . After a struggle of more than half an hour's duration, destructive of clothes and almost fatal to life or limb, reporters fought their way to a miserable little corner of one of the galleries . . . , the front seat being too far from the rail to allow of writing, and the back seat too high to be available as a seat, and twice as many reporters present as could be supplied with even standing room. But the scene within the court beggars all description. The opening of a minor London theatre for the first night of the Christmas pantomime is the only scene to which it could be compared -- crushing, yelling, jesting, shouting, and making every sort of noise."[12]

The Times devoted nearly a full page on March 13 and 14 to coverage of the trial, most of it verbatim testimony. As was the custom, the verdict -- guilty -- was reported at the end of a full story detailing the judge's charge to the jury. This contained an appeal to jurors to

> dismiss entirely from their minds whatever they had heard out of doors concerning the prisoner or against him. In this country matters became public and were subjects of pre-judgment through the instrumentality of the press, long before they came regularly under judicial investigation."[13]

Despite the sentiment of women and the lower classes against Tawell, there was a public campaign to have his sentence commuted. It was propelled by the Advertiser, which consistently opposed capital punishment. On March 22, under the simple headline "Tawell," it ran an article a column and a half in length challenging the medical evidence of Sarah Hart's poisoning by prussic acid."[14] But on the 29th, the day after the hanging, the Advertiser assured its readers that a confession made plain that Tawell had been guilty after all. Like the other papers, the Advertiser provided a graphic description of Tawell's hard death:

> The drop fell, and the wretched man became at once violently convulsed, and his whole frame quivered -- his arms and legs contracted, and he hung a motionless corpse, save that he oscillated to the motion of the wind, which was blowing strongly at the time. . . . From the first his hands were tightly bound together, and he kept his fingers locked in each other as if he still prayed, and had his mind directed towards heaven in spite of his bodily suffering."[15]

The tone of the reports of Tawell's death was, despite his confession, sadder and more respectful than that of other executions of the time. The Advertiser commended the crowd for its behaviour.

> It was expected that the wretched man would be received with groans and execrations by the crowd, but we are pleased to be able to say that no such disgraceful proceeding took place.

Yet gruesome details had to be provided to reinforce the deterrent effect.

> During the whole time that the body was suspended, the crowd manifested no desire to retire . . . . The body presented a very livid appearance and the swelling of the veins was visible from the ground. When the body was taken in, the spectators began to disperse gradually, but only to talk over what they had seen. In a short time the Market-place presented its usual appearance, and nothing remained to indicate that an awful lesson had just been read to humanity.[16]

Tawell, a gentleman, was privileged even in his execution. The hanging was carried out a few minutes early, before the crowd of about 5,000 could whip up full excitement. Four years later, in a debate with Charles Dickens as to the efficacy of public hangings, The Times pointed out that many citizens of Aylesbury were not certain that Tawell had actually died.[17]

III

It was the execution of Maria and Frederick Manning in London in 1849 that the barbaric behaviour of the crowd that provoked the criticism by Dickens. The murder by the Mannings on Aug. 9, 1849 of Patrick O'Connor, an Irishman of some substance who was working in London as a customs officer, was one of the most sensational of all Victorian crimes. Not only did it have glamour, sex, money, greed, lust and depravity, but it also touched the nobility in that before her marriage Maria Manning had been a maid to Lady Blantyre, a daughter of the Duchess of Sutherland. It was an eminently satisfactory story to report, in that a)the loss to society was not great, b)it was solved by good police work, and c)the hanging of such a spirited and defiant transgressor was a dramatic reminder of the wages of sin.

When Maria Manning discovered that O'Connor was devastated at the news of her marriage, she offered him a menage a trois. However, after the Mannings had acquired new quarters in Bermondsey, O'Connor changed his mind about moving in. Furious, this Victorian Lady Macbeth plotted to murder him to recover what was owed them. Her husband helped her dig a grave under the kitchen floor, and once she had O'Connor standing conveniently over it she shot him. When eventually the police came to ask questions, she calmly denied any knowledge of his whereabouts, but soon afterward she and her husband bolted in different directions. Days later, one of the policemen recalled that a flagstone in the floor had looked loose. He discovered O'Connor beneath it. By the time the police also found an ironmonger who remembered selling Maria Manning a shovel, a labourer who had delivered some lime for her husband, a landlady who remembered letting her into O'Connor's room on the night he had disappeared, a taxi driver who had carted her, with bag and baggage, to the railway station, etc., there was not much doubt as to who had killed O'Connor.

Still, it was highly unusual for the papers, including The Times, to solve the murder publicly even before the arrests were made. On Aug. 18, the Globe, under the heading "Frightful murder in Bermondsey," reported what the police had discovered and added: "There can hardly be any doubt that Manning or his wife committed the murder . . . ."[18]

Seven paragraphs into the story of O'Connor's murder readers of the highly respected Observer (a weekly, then as now) were told:

> That Manning and his wife were his murderers there is no present reason to doubt. They decamped immediately after police had made the first inquiries . .. ; they disposed of their furniture at a loss; they left no trace behind them as is usual in ordinary cases

> of removal, however rapidly made; and, above all, Mrs. Manning not only called at the lodgings of the murdered man . . . , but she actually opened his drawers and swept away all their valuable contents. That this frightful crime was meditated for some time is quite clear.

Readers were also told that O'Connor had been a usurer and a womanizer -- a man of sordid habits who was not liked by his colleagues. His connection with Maria Manning, "altogether of a criminal nature," had been countenanced by the husband for the purpose of obtaining O'Connor's money and property."[19]

The Times of Aug. 23 carefully reports that the shovel with which O'Connor's grave was dug "in all probability" was bought by Mrs. Manning and that "it seems" she fled intending to leave her husband to take the blame and the punishment."[20] On the first day of the trial the paper ran a leading article considering the comparative guilt of the couple and concluding that Manning was legally guilty of murder but his wife was not.[21] As the *Post* indignantly pointed out after the trial was over, there had been an interval of a few hours between the appearance of the paper and the assembly of the jurymen during which they were probably eating breakfast and perusing the paper usually read by those of their station, *The Times*."[22]

After the Attorney-General had urged the jury to dismiss from their minds anything they had heard or read about the case (a not uncommon warning at a time when full details could be published of coroners' inquests and preliminary examinations), the counsel for Frederick Manning, one Sergeant Wilkins, asked the jury rhetorically:

> How does it happen that while, as a people, we are boasting of the liberties we possess and the securities which those liberties afford us -- how does it happen, I ask, that a case of this kind is never tried, but even the counsel for the Crown and the learned judge on the bench himself feel called upon to caution you against impressions previously made -- to caution you against the efforts of those who set themselves up before the world as the defenders of our liberties, but who, in such cases, do all they can to prejudice your minds, to pervert your path, to dam up the streams of justice and prejudge the case . . . ? Who are the men who dare to dictate to a court and jury, and who seek to intimidate you into a particular verdict, because it squares with prejudices resulting from an imperfect knowledge of the whole history of the case?[23]

The dailies reported regularly on the piecemeal clues to the murder, then on the arrival in London (under police escort) of Maria Manning and her arrest, and finally on the arrival and arrest of her husband. Many of the reports were from the same correspondents or from the same source, the police. Between the first report on Aug. 18 and the end of September, The Times ran more than 30 stories, 17 more (some of these substantial, as reports of the trial were practically verbatim) in October and 25 in November before and after the execution. The dense, detailed testimony and examination were dramatic enough to have been as faithfully read as they were reported, for, since there was no denying that at least one of the Mannings was guilty, each lawyer set out to prove that the other's client had committed the murder.

On Aug.26, the Observer provided three pages of news about the case, with details of the murder, the lives of O'Connor and the Mannings, the flight of the murderers in different directions, efforts to find them, the police examination,and the inquest. Under "miscellaneous facts" it blackened her character as well as convicting her: "There seems to be little doubt that Maria Manning was as treacherous to her husband as she was to O'Connor, and that she decamped with the whole of the money and securities as soon as the suspicions of the police were awakened, leaving Manning to take his chance of being apprehended, under the hope that when he was captured, any further pursuit after her might be abandoned." Other papers, including The Times, the Manchester Guardian, the Daily News and the Express put forth this theory, which had been provided by the police.

On Oct. 25 the trial began. The Standard reported that the neighborhood of the court was "densely thronged" by 8 a.m. and the galleries crowded by 9, when proceedings began. A list of the important persons present and a description of the prisoners' appearance was provided. (Maria Manning had white ruffles on her wrists and wore white kid gloves.) Reports of the trial in all the newspapers were mere chronological transcripts, with news of the conviction coming at the end. As all the papers noted, Mrs. Manning lost control after the verdict was given, shouting, "Base, shameful England!"

On Oct. 28 the Observer put out a six-page supplement on the trial, including near-verbatim transcripts, wood-cut portraits, a description of the prisoners' removal to await execution, and an editorial containing a scathing denouncement of Sergeant Wilkins' attack on the press. The dailies provided colorful contexts for the transcripts, which took up most of the space. "The galleries were crowded by the curious in criminal jurisprudence, who had to pay for the gratification of their morbid taste at the rate of from a guinea to two guineas each for their places," said the Post. Manning was looking pale and thin in a black suit. His wife, also looking worn, "had not, however, neglected to pay great attention to her toilet." She had on a black dress, a plaid shawl of subdued colors, and a stylish cap "with an extraordinary profusion of lappets, fastened tightly under the chin, the extremities of which were richly laced and fitted, hanging down to the waist." The Herald observed that Manning had entered the courtroom with "a sullen and indifferent air, which he well sustained," adding:

> It is evident, however, that the animal are largely predominant over the intellectual faculties of the man. The whole expression of the face is of a repulsive character, though it lacks the appearance of determination and ferocity."

Breathing a sigh of relief that order had been restored, the Daily News and the Express (sister papers), praised the police work, noting

> at what hopeless odds crime has now to contend with justice. The knowledge of this will not make bad men good, but it will paralyse their arms when braced and raised for the perpetration of great offences."

The double hanging, perhaps the most sensational story in the Manning case, was thoroughly covered, with graphic descriptions. The reporter for the Advertiser commented:

> Strange it is, that the morbid thoughts and feelings of the people to witness a public strangulation are so great, that remaining throughout the night in the streets and the probability of being seriously injured or robbed, are not thought too great risks to encounter, in order to witness the terribly real drama of which Horsemonger-lane gaol was the scene yesterday morning."

The scene moved Dickens to deplore in an eloquent letter to the editor of The Times

> the atrocious bearing, looks and language, of the assembled spectators. When I came upon the scene at midnight, the shrillness of the cries and howls that were raised from time to time . . . made my blood run cold. As the night went on, screeching, and laughing, and yelling in strong chorus of parodies on Negro melodies, with substitutions of "Mrs. Manning" for "Susannah," and the like, were added to these. When the day dawned, thieves, low prostitutes, ruffians and vagabonds of every kind, flocked on to the ground, with every variety of offensive and foul behaviour. . . . When the sun rose brightly -- as it did -- it gilded thousands upon thousands of upturned faces, so inexpressibly odious in their brutal mirth or callousness, that a man had cause to feel ashamed of the shape he wore, and to shrink from himself, as fashioned in the image of the Devil.

The Times replied that it was necessary for people to know for certain that evil had been vanquished and that the wicked had been punished.[30] Another correspondent (Sidney Godolphin Osborne) deplored the tendency of some members of "respectable society" to study with opera glasses "the dying convulsions of murderers, just as they have criticized, through the same instrument, the postures of the ballet dancer!"[31] *Bell's Life in London*, a weekly strong in sporting news, argued that private executions would remove the deterrent of having to be executed before crowds. Both Mannings "shrank from meeting the condemning gaze of thousands of fellow beings."[32] The *News of the World*, a weekly for the working class, noted that the speed (three months) with which the execution followed the crime was

> proof, if such were wanted, that justice in this country pursues its victims with footsteps swift and sure, and that, though deeds of violence and blood may be concocted with the greatest premeditation, they can rarely escape the detection and punishment even of an earthly tribunal. . . .[33]

IV

The pressure from the newspapers that drove the police to locate the Mannings was mild compared with the outcry over the case of Theresa and George Sloane in 1850/51. Their appalling mistreatment of a servant-girl disgraced the professional class, and their near-escape from justice undermined confidence in public authorities.

The story was covered extensively for the two months between the preliminary investigation and the trial, and the public's mind was set against the Sloanes from the start. The *Advertiser* devoted two columns of its front page to an account of the first day of the preliminary inquiry under the heading "Charge of frightful cruelty against Mr. Sloane, of the Temple," reporting that the courtroom was crowded to excess with people who had come on the chance of seeing the girl. In an unusual treatment, the reporter combined his own observations with verbatim testimony, producing an effect of drama and immediacy. As she was brought in,

> a deep groan seemed to break from every person present involuntarily. She was, as far as it was possible to judge in her then wasted and famished condition, a rather mild and good-looking girl. She was placed in an easy chair, and supported on pillows, and during the whole course of her examination, it was almost impossible to perceive that she was living, but for the motion of her eyes and lips. She was placed by the side of the presiding alderman, who had to put his ear close to her mouth to catch the feeble accents which she uttered with great difficulty, and at long intervals.

Her detailed testimony created a sensation. "The whole of the persons assembled in court here burst into a loud and long continued yell of indignation against the defendant" as she discloses how she was forced to eat her own excrement, "nor did the officers of the court make the least attempt to repress this expression of feeling, so much did every one . . . . share the feeling of abhorrence which these disclosures produced."[34]

The play of this story in the Weekly Times was much less restrained. A month before the trial, the paper devoted nearly a full page to various aspects of the case starting with a history of legal cases of abuse of servants. This was headed "The law, as it affects the Sloanian school of domestic tyrants." [35]

Mrs. Sloane had deliberately chosen Jane Wilbred from the workhouse because the girl had no friends to keep track of her. "Shall we admit," asked the Advertiser,

> that it is a proper thing in parish authorities to lease out the services of young girls, without ever inquiring whether the servant is worthy of the mistress, or the mistress of the servant? . . . . We trust that, whatever may be the result of Mr. and Mrs. Sloane's trial, it may be productive of a more vigilant anxiety for the welfare of parish children, on the part of parish authorities.[36]

Besides beating and overworking her, the Sloanes kept her on the edge of hunger and then forced her to eat her own excrement as a punishment for having taken a spoonful of broth made for the cat, an offence she denied. Another perversion of her employers was to have her work topless in winter, so that she would feel the cold.

The servant's troubles had begun when she frightened Theresa Sloane's pet linnet by walking through a dark room with a candle. The bird subsequently died. "Never was such fiendish vengeance excited in a female mind for so trifling a cause as the supposed loss of a favourite bird," said the Sun in a post-trial editorial.

As she neared death, Jane Wilbred was too beaten down to complain, but a neighbor and colleague of Sloane noticed her condition, questioned her, removed her from his care and sought medical help. Much to the surprise of even her doctors, the girl recovered. Once the extent of the abuse became evident, the case was reported. A preliminary inquiry at which she was a witness revealed the indignities to which she had been subjected by her respectable employers. George Sloane appeared at the inquiry, but his wife, on being notified by the authorities that they would like to see her, claimed she was too ill to appear and then fled to France. Eventually, with an indignant and relentless press at their back, the police found and arrested her. The couple pleaded guilty to a series of assaults, presumably to avoid more publicity, and were sentenced to two years. The outpourings of rage and loathing in the newspapers far surpass in quantity and degree the opinions that appear in modern accounts of crime. Victorian newspapers were prepared to throw legal caution to the winds when morally outraged.

By December of 1850, when the case surfaced, the English public had had enough of the law's toleration of servant abuse. Robert and Sarah Bird had been tried for murder of their servant, Mary Ann Parsons, during the previous March and acquitted because the judge felt that it was impossible to tell who had struck the fatal blow. As well as comment before the trial, at the time of the inquest,[38] there followed a debate in the nation's editorial columns as to the solidity of the judge's position. The most vicious condemnation of the decision is to be found in the Weekly Times, which headed its commentary "Atrocious Wrong and Scandalous Impunity":

> We are forbidden to be silent not more by the atrocity of their crime than by the infernal sophistry which, emanating from the semblance of a representative of the majesty of justice, has let loose upon society two such fiends as this farmer of Buckland and his wife -- wretches who are consequently at this time desecrating God's creation by their living presence, laden with more than the guilt of Cain, but, thanks to Justice Talfourd, without Cain's brand.[39]

Pressure from the newspapers was probably responsible for the retrial of the Birds for assault during the summer of 1850. They were eventually convicted and sent to prison for 16 months, but not until after the Sloanes' trial.

After the trial, The Sun remarked that the "disgusting details" of the case were "utterly unparalleled" in the nation's criminal records. But the paper seemed satisfied that moral order had been restored. The case of the Sloanes would prove to anyone in charge of an orphan child "that an avenging Nemesis will pursue the guilty parties and eventually bring them to well-merited punishment, and cause their names to become a by-word and reproach among their fellow-subjects."[40]

The Chronicle pronounced the two-year sentence a "very cheap price" for child torture. "A mere pickpocket would fare worse at the bar of an English Criminal Court than those heartless monsters . . . ."[41]

A subsequent leader urged the government to grant guardians of the poor access to public funds for prosecution. The writer argues poignantly:

> The Jane Wilbreds and Mary Ann Parsonses -- usually the orphan or deserted children of pauper parents - picked out, perhaps, by the coarse-minded and cruel wretches who hire them, for the very reason that they have no friends to ask or care whether they live or die -- . . . from the moment that they leave the doors of the workhouse, . . . are a safe mark for almost any kind or degree of oppression which malignity or selfish parsimony may have the heart to inflict. . . . It was by the merest chance that Jane Wilbred was snatched from the fangs of the Sloanes, before stripes, starvation, and poison terminated her misery and silenced her testimony.[42]

V

As The Times recognized, "Publicity is the best protection against abuse."[43] It is unlikely that the Birds would have been retried on a lesser charge after being acquitted of murder, that Mrs. Sloane would have been retrieved to stand trial, and that the Sloanes would have been sent away for two years, had the newspapers not fanned public opinion against what they quite reasonably considered tyranny and privilege. Realizing that the law was an imperfect instrument, they tried, even if they had to go beyond its bounds, to manipulate it to serve society more justly than it would if it were not guided by public opinion. That is why the dull-looking newspapers of the mid-nineteenth century were able to be even more sensational than their modern counterparts, convicting ahead of the court, providing graphic, sickening details, hounding the authorities for vengeance.

Sensationalism followed a pattern in the 1840s, as it does today, but it was a different one. Newspapers did not regard the arousal of public opinion as an end in itself. They saw themselves as instruments, or at least as catalysts, of justice, sometimes to the extent of prodding the police to arrest and the bench to convict in a way that would not be tolerated today. They promoted changes in laws or judicial procedures when cases they were reporting revealed problem areas. They sought to improve social attitudes. If their coverage of trials indicates that they regarded the court as theatre, their coverage of executions and events leading up to them shows that at the same time they recognized a stern educational function. Today, when there is little need for newspapers to assist the police or guide the judiciary and in fact there are strong legal deterrents against these functions, sensational crime reporting is by comparison a matter of mere entertainment.

Judith Knelman
Graduate School of Journalism
University of Western Ontario

1. R.D. Blumenfeld, The Press in My Time (London: Rich and Cowan Ltd., 1933), 32.

2. Stanley Morison, The English Newspaper [1622-1932] (Cambridge: University Press, 1932), 280-281.

3. In 1845, Jane Crosby was acquitted of the murder of Sarah Ann Crosby largely because the only witness was another child.

4. In 1848, Jane Pullen was sentenced to a year in prison for the murder of her daughter Ann.

5. Mercy Catherine Newton was tried three times between 1849 and 1850 for the murder of her mother, Ann Newton, on 5 Dec. 1848.

6. On July 24, 1848, William Henry Woodhouse was executed for this murder. Both the Morning Chronicle (July 7, p. 8) and Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper (July 9, p. 2) described him as extremely repulsive.

7. Morning Advertiser, 29 March 1845, p. 3.

8. Times, 3 Jan. 1845, p. 7. The Globe and the Standard often had identical dispatches; I cite here their first appearance, which was consistently in The Times.

9. Times, 6 Jan., p.7.

10. Times, 6 Jan. 1845, p. 7.

11. Morning Herald, 9 Jan. 1845, p. 5.

12. Morning Herald, 13 March 1845, p. 5.

13. The Times, 15 March 1845, p. 5.

14. Morning Advertiser, 26 and 27 March 1845, p. 3.

15. Morning Advertiser, 29 March 1845, p. 3.

16. Advertiser, 29 March 1845, p. 3.

17. 20 Nov. 1849, p. 4.

18. Globe, 18 Aug. 1849, p. 4.

19. Observer, 19 Aug., 1849, p. 5. A newspaper ran little risk in blackening the character of a man already dead and with no family, but there even if no charge of contempt of court were laid (and such charges were rare at the time) there was the possibility of being sued for libel by the Mannings should they have been found not guilty of the murder.

20. Times, 23 Aug., 1849, p. 5.

21. The Times, 25 Oct. 1849, p. 4.

22. Morning Post, 29 Oct., 1849, p. 4.

23. Observer supplement, 28 Oct. 1849, p. 3.

24. Observer, 26 Aug., 1849, p. 5.

25. Standard, 26* Oct. 1849, p. 2.

26. Morning Post, 26 Oct., 1849, p. 5.

27. Morning Herald, 26 Oct., p.5. Charles Mitchell, in The Newspaper Press Directory, 3rd edition (London: C. Mitchell, 1851), says of the Herald: "One main merit of this paper is its aversion to, and inclination to avoid, any ministering to the morbid curiosity which loves to revel in nauseous details of blood and crime" (76). This treatment, then, is testimony to the demand by the public for as much news as possible of the Mannings.

28. Daily News, 27 Oct., 1849, p. 4; Daily Express, 27 Oct., 1849, p. 2.

29. Morning Advertiser, 14 Nov., 1849, p. 3.

30. The Times, 20 Nov. 1849, p. 4.

31. The Times, 17 Nov. 1849, p. 4.

32. Bell's Life in London, 25 Nov., 1849, p. 2.

33. News of the World, 18 Nov., 1849, p. 3.

34. Morning Advertiser, 9 Dec. 1850, p. 1.

35. Weekly Times, 5 Jan. 1851, p. 3.

36. Morning Advertiser, 17 Dec. 1850, p. 2.

37. Evening Sun, 6 Feb. 1861, p. 2.

38.See "Horrible Cruelty," The Times, 2 Feb. 1850, p.8, continued in supplement, p. .1, and "The Case of Mary Ann Parsons," Daily News, 5 Feb. 1850, p. 4.

39. Weekly Times, 31 March 1850, p. 264.

40. Evening Sun, 6 Feb. 1851, p. 2.

41. Morning Chronicle, 6 Feb. 1851, p. 5.

42. Morning Chronicle, 8 Feb. 1851, p. 5.

43. Times, 31 March 1845, p. 6.